DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 729 CE 064 957

AUTHOR	Newman, Anabel P.; And Others
TITLE	Prison Literacy: Implications for Program and Assessment Policy.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Bloomington, IN.; National Center on Adult Literacy, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCAL-TR-93-1
PUB DATE	Sep 93
CONTRACT	R117Q0003
NOTE	212p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center on Adult Literacy, Dissemination/Publications, University of Pennsylvania, 3910 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3111 ($12; checks payable to Kinko's Copy Center).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *Correctional Education; *Correctional Rehabilitation; Demonstration Programs; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Educational Research; Females; Illiteracy; *Literacy Education; Literature Reviews; Minority Groups; Prisoners; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; *Recidivism; Student Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The United States confronts the problem of a large and growing prison population, the majority of which is insufficiently literate. Added to the general effects of educational disability are the marginalizing factors of ethnicity, class, socioeconomic deprivation, and other handicaps. Historically, the situation in prison literacy is 150 years of reform attempts with uneven results, spotty application, and meager support. Despite increasing legal and social opinion in favor of inmates' greater rights to literacy and education, practice still lags far behind statute. Studies by U.S. and Canadian researchers reveal that the "right kind" of education in prison can reduce recidivism. The "right kind" of education is not premised on a penal mentality, but seeks to include moral education, democratic self-rule in the "just community," and instruction in the humanities, with a strong cognitive appeal, delivered by means of andragogical methods. An ideal program in prison literacy is one that educates inmates broadly, is governed for the sake of the learners, is cost effective, improves quality of life, and makes appropriate use of educational technology. Prison educators should critique current assessment and evaluation methods, undertake new and improved approaches, and establish improved standards. (Appendixes include a checklist of questions to analyze programmatic prison education, 84 endnotes, and 830 references.) (YLB)

ED 363 729

NCAL
NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY

PRISON LITERACY:

IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM AND ASSESSMENT POLICY

Anabel P. Newman
Warren Lewis
Caroline Beverstock

Indiana University

TECHNICAL REPORT TR93-1
SEPTEMBER 1993

CO-PUBLISHED WITH

ERIC®
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND
COMMUNICATION SKILLS
2805 EAST 10TH STREET, SUITE 150
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47408-2698

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CE 064 957

NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
3910 CHESTNUT STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-3111
TEL: (215) 898-2100 FAX: (215) 898-9804

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRISON LITERACY:

IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM AND ASSESSMENT POLICY

Anabel P. Newman
Warren Lewis
Caroline Beverstock

Indiana University

TECHNICAL REPORT TR93-1
SEPTEMBER 1993

CO-PUBLISHED WITH

ERIC

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND
COMMUNICATION SKILLS
2805 EAST 10TH STREET, SUITE 150
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47408-2698

This work was supported by funding from the National Center on Adult Literacy at the University of Pennsylvania, which is part of the Educational Research and Development Center Program (grant No. R117Q00003) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S.Department of Education, in cooperation with the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement or the U.S. Department of Education.

CO-PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1993 BY
THE NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY AND
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS

National Center on Adult Literacy
3910 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-3111

The National Center on Adult Literacy (NCAL) was established in 1990 by the U.S. Department of Education, with co-funding from the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services. The mission of NCAL addresses three primary challenges: (1) to enhance the knowledge base about adult literacy, (2) to improve the quality of research and development in the field and (3) to ensure a strong, two-way relationship between research and practice. Through applied research and development and dissemination of the results to researchers, policymakers and practitioners, NCAL seeks to improve the quality of adult literacy programs and services on a nationwide basis. NCAL serves as a major operating unit of the Literacy Research Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills
2805 East 10th Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, Indiana 47408-2698

ERIC (an acronym for Educational Resources Information Center) is a national network of 16 clearinghouses, each of which is responsible for building the ERIC database by identifying and abstracting various educational resources, including research reports, curriculum guides, conference papers, journal articles, and government reports. The Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS) collects educational information specifically related to reading, English, journalism, speech, and theater at all levels. ERIC/RCS also covers interdisciplinary areas, such as media studies, reading and writing technology, mass communication, language arts, critical thinking, literature, and many aspects of literacy.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RI88062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the hidden benefits of the research needed for a document as demanding as this one is that you meet wonderful people all over the country who are doing their jobs competently, who provide information willingly, and who are appreciative of interest in a topic that generally inspires fear, disgust, or agony.

We found the people immensely helpful at the National Institute of Justice, U. S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Office of Justice Programs, Rockville, Maryland. Kathy Meyers and colleagues met our every request with dispatch and cordiality. Gerald Wong, Education Specialist in the Education Division of Justice, was equally helpful.

Other people interested in education in prisons and jails from California to Virginia, from Boulder, Colorado, to Amherst, Massachusetts, were both willing and eager to contribute to what they perceived as a needed volume. We extend our heartfelt appreciation to all of the reviewers of the first versions of the manuscript, which were more than 500 pages long.

Anita Aldrich, Professor Emeritus, Indiana University; Norman Brier, Robert F. Kennedy Center, New York; Emily Herrick, Director, Literacy Services, Contact Center, Lincoln, Nebraska; Ronald Eagleye Johnny, Program Attorney, Academic Department, National Judicial College, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada; Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Washington, DC; V. Robert Payant, Dean, National Judicial College, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada; Samuel F. Saxton, Director, The Prince Georges County Government, Department of Corrections, Upper Marlboro, Maryland; Robert Waxler, English Department, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, Massachusetts; and Gail Zittell, Principal, Adult Education, Elk Grove Unified School District, Elk Grove, California.

We early discovered that the research literature on prison literacy is far more abundant and available than anyone connected with this project had suspected. We thank those who persevered with us through the daunting tasks of examining more than 3,000 separate published and unpublished documents.

We extend appreciative acknowledgments also to Dan Wagner and Dick Venezky of the National Center on Adult Literacy who, patient with our early drafts, encouraged production of the slimmed-down version we now present. We thank Sheila Witherington, also of NCAL, for her editing skills in helping us to polish the finished product.

On a personal note, a word must be said about how the book was actually written. In addition to ordinary use of the library and the standard electronic information retrieval systems, including especially the database of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), we made extensive use of the data bank of the National Institute of Justice (NCJRS). The NCJRS collection is more useful than any other single resource, especially for locating otherwise elusive documents.

This report has been prepared by a team of authors more expert in literacy matters than in corrections. Caroline Beverstock and I, assisted by our editor, Warren Lewis, published "Adult Literacy: Contexts and Challenges" (ERIC/RCS and IRA, 1990), and "Adult Literacies: Intersections with Elementary and Secondary Education" (Phi Delta Kappa and ERIC/RCS, 1991).

Caroline Beverstock is a learning skills expert and literacy scholar, the chair of the Adult Literacy Special Interest Group of the International Reading Association (IRA), and a member of IRA's Commission on Family and Intergenerational Literacy. She has designed and taught in programs for out-of-school youths and automotive and electronics technicians; acted as consultant with library-based literacy programs and the Private Industry Council of San Francisco; taught study skills at the Student Academic Center at Indiana University (Bloomington), where she is also associate coordinator of the I.U. Literacy Forum. She has taught study skills and humanities at the Lady Elizabeth Campus, Martin University's college inside Indiana Women's Prison (Indianapolis). Beverstock provided insight and background experience, especially on the topics of assessment and evaluation.

Warren Lewis is Director of Publications at the Educational Resources Information Center, the Clearinghouse for Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS) at Indiana University (Bloomington). He also chairs the Division of Humanities at Martin University (Indianapolis), including its Lady Elizabeth campus inside Indiana Women's Prison. He made effective use of both of those resources to gain insight into our subject. In spite of time constraints and the meager funds available for the *project, his major effort at working through and organizing the information got us started.*

My major role, besides organizing the troops, has been to certify the implications of prison education as it is reported here in terms of my involvement in, and study of, the field of adult literacy. I am the two-term chair of the National Coalition for Literacy, co-designer of CONSULT-1® (an expert system that uses artificial intelligence with statistical pattern recognition to make reading strategy recommendations based on actual learner characteristics), Director of the Reading Practicum Center, and Professor of Language Education at Indiana University (Bloomington).

We thank each of the dedicated Indiana University students who have assisted in various ways with the project: Bernadette Lehman and her daughter, Katie, who pitched in when we were drowning in references; Debbie Saxon whose scholarly analysis helped us launch and sustain the project; James Chipless who assisted in the immense job of categorizing the material; Robert Leming who provided first-hand knowledge of jail codes and conditions; Kurt Messick, a wizard at the computer keyboard as well as a master of the fine art of bibliography; and Judee Reel who mastered uncooperative software to generate the original bibliography.

Like mountain climbers, we have scaled this mountain of human tragedy and despair because it is there. We hope that these results suggest to others ways of scaling back, bit by bit, the waste of human potential which now costs Americans millions of dollars more than we would have to pay to give inmates an habilitative education. "Habilitate" is used in this report in the archaic sense to refer to the process of giving or gaining more ability, to make more capable, or to qualify. This term is used—as opposed to "rehabilitate"—because the position of this study is based on the premise that prison inmates have not had the ability, capability, or qualifications needed in the first place. In other words, the use of the term "rehabilitate" infers a reclaiming of something that was lost, and such a definition does not apply in this study.

Anabel P. Newman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i
Table of Contents v
Preface vii
Abstract ix
A Reader's Guide xiii
A. Statement of the Problem: Putting America's Illiterates Behind Bars 1
B. What the Statistics Do and Do not Tell Us 5
C. Who Are the Incarcerated Needing Literacy Instruction? 9
1. The Educationally Disadvantaged 9
2. African-Americans 10
3. Hispanics 11
4. Native-Americans 12
5. Women 13
6. The Educationally Disabled 16
D. The Background of Prison Literacy 21
1. A History of Reform and Rehabilitation 21
2. Public Policy since "the Great Society" 28
E. Illiteracy and Criminality: Literacy is a Way Out 31
1. Recidivism, Education, and the Adult Offender 33
2. "Nothing Works" 34
3. Education Works 35
F. The Paradigms of Prison Education 39
1. The Punishment Paradigm 40
2. The Education Paradigm 43
3. Moral Education 45
4. Democratic Self-Rule in the "Just Community" 45
5. The Humanities Component 46
6. The Cognitive Element 47
7. Andragogy 49
G. Literacy Programs in Prisons and Jails 53
1. State-of-the-Art Reports 53
2. Local Jails 55

H. Implications for a Model Literacy Program in Prisons and Jails 59
1. A Literacy Program Educates Broadly 60
2. A Literacy Program Is Governed for the Sake of the Learners 61
3. A Literacy Program Makes Prison Life More Livable 64
4. A Literacy Program Is Cost-Effective 68
5. A Literacy Program Improves the Quality of Life 70
6. A Literacy Program Has a New-Reader's Library 73
7. A Literacy Program Makes Appropriate Use of Educational Technology 76
8. A Literacy Program Is the Right Thing to Do 80

I. Assessment of Learners and Evaluation of Programs 83
1. Assessment and Evaluation Defined 83
2. Limits to Research 84
3. Limits to the Tests 87
4. Approaches to Assessment 88
5. Approaches to Evaluation: How to Assess for Success in a Prison Program 92

Appendix A
Checklist of Questions for Those Who Provide Literacy Instruction in Prisons and Jails 95
Paradigms (Examples or Models) of Prison Education 95
Programs 98
Educational Staff 105
Governance 109
Communications 110
Resources, Libraries, and Technology 111
Resources—Facility and Materials 111
Libraries 112
Technology 113
Assessment and Evaluation 116
Jails 119
Policy 122

Appendix B
Areas in Need of Further Study 129

Endnotes 133

Bibliography 149

9

PRISON LITERACY:

IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAM AND ASSESSMENT POLICY

ANABEL P. NEWMAN
WARREN LEWIS
CAROLINE BEVERSTOCK

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Preface

America — wealthy, educated, and democratic — truly has a problem of too much illiteracy among its people and an even greater problem with illiteracy among its people in prisons and jails. Whereas the "literacy movement" is an indication that America is resolute and willing to deal with illiteracy in general, America is by and large ignoring the latter problem, which — despite valiant efforts by a few — is worsening. America's more than 1,000,000 people behind bars (more than any other nation and three times as many as the nations of the European Community, most of them illiterate drop-outs from our schools and rejects of our society, are a national cancer eating quietly away at our economic substance and our will to pledge to one another the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" (Jones, 1988). Prison illiteracy is America's secret shame. It is the problem that most educators do not know about, most politicians do not acknowledge, most corrections professionals are unprepared to deal with, and most tax-payers resent having to pay for.

ABSTRACT

America, already with far more of its people behind bars than in any other other country and the prison populaton rising steadily, confronts a double problem: the majority of prison inmates are (by almost any definition) also insufficiently literate. A strong correlation exists between ordinary criminal behavior and educational insufficiency, so that the numbers of adjudicated persons who are inadequately literate will tend to be higher than in the rest of the population. Add to the general effects of educational disability the marginalizing factors of ethnicity, class, socio-economic deprivation, and other handicaps, and one has the formula for America's epidemic case of prison illiteracy.

Historically, the situation in prison literacy is a 150-year-old narrative of reforming energies with uneven results, spotty application, and meager support. Even so, the effort to deliver literacy to inmates of America's federal and state prisons, reformatories, and city and county jails has generated a roster of noble names—William Rogers, Jared Curtis, Galord Hubbells, Zebulon Brockway, E. C. Wines, Gideon Haynes, Homer Lane, Thomas Mott Osborne, Fred Nelles, and Austin MacCormick (among others)—leading to today's growing guild of corrections experts, teachers, librarians, researchers, literacy volunteers, and other advocates of greater literacy for inmates for many very good reasons.

The present scene is acted out before the backdrop of the social reforms during the Johnson Administration of the mid-1960s, the significant turning point for prison education in the second half of the 20th century. Despite even the ripening of legal and social opinion in favor of inmates' greater rights to literacy and education since the Great Society, practice still lags far behind statute. The federal system and a few state systems are best-organized to deliver educational services to inmates, followed by most state systems, and the local jails bring up the rear.

Because illiteracy and criminality are umbilically joined, it stands to reason that greater literacy would have a dampening effect on criminality. The result of research, on balance, seems to be that this, in fact, is the case: greater literacy is a way out of criminality, and improving literacy is a way of reducing criminal recidivism among the adjudicated. Despite a widespread perception that "nothing works," careful studies, and the review of studies by American and Canadian researchers, reveal that the

"right kind" of education in prison can statistically, though not predictably in individual cases, reduce recidivism and increase inmates' chances for staying on the *outside* and living a more satisfying, profitable life after they have been released.

By the "right kind" of education, one does not mean education in prison premised on the penal mentality of those far too numerous in the correctional establishment who think that punishment of the law-breaker is the purpose of prison, and that security is the most important feature of a prison. Rather, one means growth in literacies that include moral education, democratic self-rule in the "just community," instruction in the humanities, with a strong appeal to the cognitive, delivered by means of andragogical instruction, in company with training in a variety of skills to enable the inmate to cope with the personal, sexual, familial, chemical, economic, vocational, and social problems of life, thereby to gain a realistic sense of one's individual worth as a human being.

Prison education programs in their hundreds exist; various methods have been tried, some of which were successful; researchers have tallied statistics and made reports; and periodic reviews of most aspects of prison education have been registered—enough so that one can begin to draw conclusions that some ways are better than others. One can predict, for example, that vocational education that is about meaningful, satisfying, and marketable labor, when it is accompanied by other kinds of learning as well, will prove beneficial; otherwise, it will not. One can also predict that privatized education—education run by educators rather than be correctionists—will have better effects. And one can predict that the educational program in prisons where the human factor of antagonism among corrections professionals, educators, and inmates has been alleviated, will do better.

One can, therefore, set down certain implications for a model literacy program in prisons and jails. An ideal program in prison literacy is, and ought to be, one that educates inmates broadly, is governed for the sake of the learners, that makes prison life more livable for all concerned, that is cost-effective, that improves the quality of life in the prison, that has a new-reader's library, that makes appropriate use of educational technology, and that, therefore, typifies the essential rightness in a civilized society of allowing even criminals to take advantage of the curative and regenerative process of education.

The results of study, and the review of studies, of prison education thus allows this increasingly professionalized discipline to engage in meta-critical reflection upon its own methods of self-analysis, to recognize the limits of previous research, to criticize the several means of assessment and evaluation now being employed, to undertake new and better approaches to assessment, and to erect for itself improved standards of assessment and evaluation. A final section on assessment in this study on assessment leads to a detailed checklist of questions, the most detailed protocol yet devised as a means to analysis of programmatic prison education.

The "Checklist of Questions" at the end is for policymakers and researchers as well as for literacy providers, for it is an applied and pragmatic summary of most of the critical implications raised in this report.

A READER'S GUIDE

In an effort to make this information as accessible as possible to our intended audiences—policymakers and legislators, corrections administrators, and educators in prisons and jails—we have distilled the implications of research findings into questions (See Appendix A) to consider when studying the following:

- the effectiveness of a given prison-literacy program
- the best policy to implement
- the most helpful laws to pass
- the best ways to set up and manage an effective literacy program inside
- the best ways to teach people in prison

No one institution is likely to answer "yes" to all the questions, or to be able to tackle all questions at once. However, our hope is that these distillations will help focus future directions in our correctional facilities so that they may be *correctional* and responsive to some of the most effective efforts in our country today. The questions are arranged topically so that readers may consider a single area at a time (*technology*, for example).

Perhaps a useful approach would be for prison or jail administrative and educational personnel, ideally including representative inmates, to discuss a priority ranking of the questions for consideration. In this way, broad goals might be set, with focus on a number of specific goals to be achieved in the short term and reserving others for the longer term.

Subsequent chapters provide the contexts from which the questions were derived. Although the book is essentially focused on programs and program assessment in prisons and jails, the early chapters provide background to the last two chapters which are specifically about programs and their assessment.

We hope that veterans in correctional work will find these pages as useful as newcomers and others who may be searching for information and answers. There is plenty of work for all of us.

Anabel Newman
Warren Lewis
Caroline Beverstock

A. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM: PUTTING AMERICA'S ILLITERATES BEHIND BARS

This report examines the professional and research literature concerning the state of literacy instruction of adult inmates in correctional institutions in America to address the question: what are the most effective ways to deliver literacy instruction in prisons and in jails?

The literature is abundant, the history long, the issues complex, the efforts and results mixed, and the human need great. In order to answer the literacy question, a variety of themes have been explored:

- literacy, (re)habilitation, and recidivism
- social, economic, gender, and ethnic implications of the widespread illiteracy among educationally disadvantaged inmates
- the history and practice of theoretical paradigms and styles of correctional education
- the varying effects of education, or of its lack, upon the adjudicated

Much prison-related research has been conducted by Canadians, and Canadian Thomas Townsend opens the conversation regarding the establishment of education in prisons and jails as a separate and specialized field. This report is an attempt to contribute to the discovery-for-advantage to which Townsend refers. Existing research, though neither exhaustive nor perfect, can inform practice to the advantage of the habilitation of the inmates and for everyone else concerned—prison officials, educators, and tax-payers.

> *Correctional educators have made enormous strides by addressing the staggering problem of prison illiteracy. Beyond literacy, though, correctional education has the potential to yield positive changes in offenders' lives. We must now move on to discover, and take advantage of, this potential through informed research and practice.*
>
> *To consider prison education as only palliative is to ignore its rich potential to contribute substantively to the*

correctional agenda. To be rehabilitative, correctional education must be responsive to the particular learning needs of offenders, have content that focuses specifically on changing pro-criminal values, beliefs, and attitudes, and integrate its activities with other correctional treatment initiatives.

The majority of offenders enter our correctional establishments with poor academic skills. Too little attention is given to why this is the case. In recent years, assessments of offenders have pointed to a high incidence of learning difficulties. Offenders also seem to differ markedly from non-offending populations in preferred learning styles; they favor an intense, hands-on approach rather than the more passive, visual methods practiced in our schools. These facts argue for a different teaching approach in a correctional setting than that offered in the community at large.

The curriculum of most correctional education programs emphasizes basic skills to address illiteracy. Although mastery of these skills can serve as strong motivation for the individual learner, the correlation between illiteracy and criminality cannot be considered causal. Research showing improved reintegration of offenders who have completed an Adult Basic Education program is encouraging. The challenge for researchers is to identify which aspects of the program constitute the contributing influence. However, research is unlikely to point to any existing basic curriculum as a positive influence....The development of a specific curriculum that blends basic academic skills with material that stimulates social learning must remain a critical priority.

Education in most correctional jurisdictions is a "stand alone" activity, with little interaction with other areas of corrections. This isolation is reinforced in correctional systems that contract with local school districts or private schools. Even in settings where teachers are employees, corrections-specific training is generally not provided. Because of the lack of specialized services, prison teachers are usually forced to seek professional development in the outside teaching community and are disadvantaged in dealing with prison-specific problems.

More recently, greater emphasis has been placed on co-ordinating the efforts of academic upgrading,

> *vocational training, and prison industries. These efforts should be encouraged. Moreover, the educational program needs to be more closely integrated with programs on social skills, substance abuse, anger management and family violence. (Townsend, 1991, p. 2).*

B. WHAT THE STATISTICS DO AND DO NOT TELL US

According to the most recent reports, the following details give some indication of the overall picture: the most up-to-date summary report in print that we were able to find confirmed the general impression that one gains from surveying previous reports, estimates, and local studies. Using a sixth-grade level as the standard for literacy, 50% of the adult inmates in U.S. prisons are illiterate. Using a 12th-grade level as the standard, 75% of inmates are illiterate, i.e., the illiteracy level of the prison population is approximately three times that of the general population (Ryan, 1990), and the numbers are even worse in some sections of the country where general educational levels are lower and class distinctions sharper (Martin, 1979a & b). Even though the home, the church, and the society—increasingly in ethnic, economic, and class breakdown—must all take their share of the blame (Davidson, 1989; cf. Thompson & Doddler, 1986; Wiley & Conciatore, 1989), among the incarcerated, the inadequacy of American public-school education and its GED-style equivalents becomes patent. Schools are scrambling to become more of the solution and less of the problem (Mauers, 1974; Phillips & Kelly, 1979).

Statistics published in 1976 are largely valid today:

- 75 to 90% of juvenile offenders have learning disabilities.
- Up to 50% of adult inmates are functionally illiterate.
- Up to 90% of adult inmates are school drop-outs (Herschler, 1976).

In 1979, the U. S. Bureau of Prisons estimated that approximately 50% of adult inmates in federal and state facilities could neither read nor write. At least 90% of all inmates had not completed high school, and the majority had less than an eighth-grade education. According to the Bureau's own 1972 policy, a sixth-grade reading level was required before inmates might be released, but the Bureau's policy was ahead of its practice. The demands of the Adult Education Act, under which most prison education programs were funded, that "functional literacy" at the ABE level should be attained by inmates, were not being met. Most inmates lacked literacy sufficient to understand a newspaper, read a driver-instruction manual, grasp job instructions, balance a checkbook, or do tax returns (Pollack, 1979).

The U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, reported prison populations as follows in 1986 (Bessette, 1989, p. 36):

- 95.6% were males, 4.4% were females (There are more females now than there were then.)
- 49.7% were Caucasian, 46.9% were African-American, 12.6% were Hispanic (There are more people of color now than there were then.)
- 85.4% were between the ages of 18 and 39
- 20.2% were veterans
- 60.2% had children (Because there are more women now, there are more inmates who have the care of dependent children.)
- 82.8% had been service workers, farm workers, crafts people, equipment operators, or laborers
- 57.5% had less than a 12th-grade education, with grade completion rates (as shown in Table 1).

TABLE 1
Grade Completion Rates of Adult Inmates

GRADE LEVEL	COMPLETION RATE (%)
none	0.4
1-6	2.0
7 & 8	14.2
9	14.2
10	15.2
11	11.5
12	15.3
GED	9.7
some college	13.3

The foregoing and subsequent statistics need to be understood in light of the three-tiered American structure of prisons. Federal prisons hold the least numbers, often provide more comfortable conditions, are harder to get into than other facilities for a narrower range of crimes, and are populated by white-collar criminals and others who are, for any number of reasons, the polar opposites of their demographic counterparts in state institutions. Local jails fall democratically between the two extremes, and they represent a cross-section of the local population. Thus, education statistics tend to be the worst in state institutions, and the best in federal institutions, with few reliable statistics available on local jails. If one premises an opinion about prison literacy solely on federal statistics, which are the most numerous, the picture will inevitably be rosier than is the general reality.

In 1988, the Bureau published comparative figures for state prisons in 1979 and local jails in 1983 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988). The "technical appendix" to that report concluded with the still-valid statement that "the level of education reached by jail and prison inmates was far below the national average" (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988, p. 33).

C. WHO ARE THE INCARCERATED NEEDING LITERACY INSTRUCTION?

1. THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

Incarcerated learners are primarily males, primarily from socio-economically deprived backgrounds, and about equal numbers of Causasians and non-Causasians. The numbers of African-American males have been growing, along with their crippling school failure rate (50% to 65% generally, and as high as 90% or 95% in some schools), as have the numbers of Hispanics, whose problem with English as a second language sets them apart with a special need. Considering the close association between illiteracy and some forms of criminal behavior, it may be concluded that many inmates, had they succeeded in school, might well not be in prison.

Attitudes toward the criminal population, most of which come from the underclasses, are further contaminated by racism and genderism.

Acknowledgment of the special needs of special groups among the incarcerated and recognition of inmates as individuals with individual needs have been slow in coming, but they are the essence of literacy instruction and education inside prisons. The educationally disadvantaged, the severely learning-disabled, and the emotionally disturbed have been often lumped together in perception and programs. Throughout the 19th century and well into the 20th, prejudicial attitudes have been expressed towards educating inmates. For example, what little education was available to females in prison was aimed at their becoming wives or domestics; African-American inmates were usually denied education or else were trained as manual laborers; neither instruction in Spanish nor help with their English was available for Hispanics; and Caucasian males were trained as craftsmen or farmers. Only religious instruction was available to all (Pisciotta, 1983).

Concern for dealing with the literacy needs of juvenile offenders is obviously of tremendous concern. However, given the immense amount of literature to review and the space constraints of this manuscript, a conscious decision was made not to include juvenile corrections in the review. Nevertheless, we would most certainly recommend that a thorough review of this body of work be undertaken. As with instruction in reading for children, adolescents, young adults, and adults, the earlier effective instruction can be given, the more likely society will be able to welcome the recipients as literate, contributing, fulfilled adult citizens.

2. AFRICAN-AMERICANS

With few, little-known exceptions [such as the work of Velma Dolphin Ashley (Revere, 1989), education of African-Americans inside prisons was the equivalent of most education for African-Americans outside, until the reforms of the civil rights movement began to take effect. The situation today is better in principle, but often not in practice (Black, 1984), as is pointed out in the title of one report: "Prison Education Programs Attempt to Pick Up Where Society Failed" (Wiley, 1989a & b).

In 1991, America achieved two punishing distinctions: it held the record for the world's highest rate of incarceration (426 prisoners per 100,000 population), and the incarceration rate of African-American males (3,109 per 100,000) was four times that of South Africa (729 per 100,000) where Apartheid was legal.[1] Studies indicate that the disequality of the races extends into the prisons after adjudication. While about 50% of inmates in 1990 were non-Caucasian, only 28.7% of the custodial staff and 25.3% of correctional personnel overall were non-Caucasian (Camp & Camp, 1990, pp. 49-50). Testing with culturally biased instruments may be another form of racism in correctional education (Besag & Greene, 1985).

Many of the studies that point to racial inequities also indicate that they need not continue (Georgia Prisons, 1976; Pass, 1988; Wright, 1989). Other studies make clear that educational programs with African-American inmates can be, and often are, both successful and cost-effective. Wiley, for example, suggests that it is cheaper to educate illiterate African-American inmates intercepted early enough in their criminal careers, and return them to society as law-abiding and tax-paying citizens, than it is to keep them as permanent residents at the public's expense (Wiley, 1989).

Petersen's detailed plan for African-American-oriented correctional education is now out-of-date, but it was essentially sound in theory (Petersen, 1975). Experimental programs of various kinds have demonstrated both the educability of African-American inmates and the promise for habilitation inherent in providing them educational opportunities (Martin, 1979a & b). If habilitation is the purpose of incarceration, then education in prison is, for many African-Americans, the first opportunity to succeed at education and acquire a sense of achievement that can replace feelings of hostility and inadequacy (Black, 1984). Many studies have shown that under enriched conditions, African-American inmates' mental dispositions as well as their language abilities, both speaking and reading, improve measurably (Haber, 1983; Kanel & Ayllon, 1976; Lewis, 1985; McKee, Roy, Jenkins, Carmen, & Hart, 1970; Williams, 1978). When adjustment patterns of African-American male prison inmates were studied, researchers found that those who took part in college studies were more aggressive and more highly motivated than non-students who tended to be more insecure and had a lower self-image (Haber, 1983).

Although one study showed that the presence of African-American guards among African-American inmates did not necessarily improve a prison's atmosphere, the implication should not be drawn to suggest that African-American educators would not make a difference for African-American inmates (Jacobs & Kraft, 1983). Educators know, for many other reasons, that teachers with whom the students can identify have a positive edge in the classroom, just as a teacher towards whom students feel ethnic antipathy is liable to be an educational deficit (Karcz, 1985). Education in correctional institutions involves a highly specialized form of teaching dictated by the ethnic and age characteristics of the adult learners; therefore, special training needs to be given to prison educators to prepare them to teach in an environment that is more ethnically diverse than is the public-school classroom (Norde, 1980). African-Americans and other ethnic-minority communities, with the empowering help of the larger society, can sometimes be the best-qualified agents to solve their indigenous problems (Youth and the Justice System, 1984) and to keep the delinquents in their communities from becoming criminals (McKenna, 1974).

3. HISPANICS

The U.S. prison population of Hispanics overall has fluctuated at a rate between 9.6% and 12.2% over the past few years, quite above the approximate 8% rate of Hispanics within the total U.S. population. In those states with a significantly higher proportion of Hispanic inmates—New Mexico, 54%; New York, 32.3%; and Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Texas, and the federal system each with above 20% Hispanic inmates—the problems of the ESL learner become problems to be solved by prison educators. In states where other ethnic groups, e.g., various Asian-Americans who are not native speakers of English are statistically significant in prisons—e.g., Hawaii, 44.4%, California, 4.8 %; and Colorado, Nevada, Utah, and the federal system (all above 2%)—prison educators are required who can teach effectively in a multicultural environment, even though the smaller numbers pose less of a problem than does the growing number of Hispanics (Camp & Camp, 1990, p. 5; Dillingham, 1991, p. 66).

Following the lead of New Mexico and Texas, the federal system began to address the bilingual needs of its Hispanic residents in 1973 when a study revealed that about 18.5% of the total federal inmate population had Spanish surnames, but only 2.5% of the federal staff was bicultural or bilingual (McCollum, 1978). Thereafter, California and New York initiated programs in bilingual and bicultural education (Hamilton, 1985; Castro, 1977, 1981; Hispanic Inmate Needs, 1986).[2]

The Texas D.O.C. guide for teaching illiterate and non-English-speaking inmates provides a recommendation for an individualized approach in the use of proficiency tests for identifying an inmate's needs (Brown, 1973). In both New York and New Jersey, as is also the case with African-Americans, the failure of public-school education to help Hispanics achieve full literacy has been cited as a contributive factor to their criminal behavior (Sainz & Biggins, 1979). In a Connecticut prison where the authorities and most of the inmates all spoke English, the radio programs were all in English, and the loud-speaker invariably gave commands in English, the Spanish-speaking Puerto Riqueños viewed themselves as symbolically imprisoned by the English language (Pinton, 1978). In view of the increasing numbers and diversity of incarcerated Hispanics from all over Latin America during the 1980s, we found research and reporting on the progress of bilingual education in prison to be especially meager.

4. NATIVE-AMERICANS

Whereas bilingual education of non-native-English speakers is merely inadequate, and the prison education of African-Americans is an agony, the educational situation of Native-American inmates is a human tragedy and quite consistent with the immigrant American's historic antipathy towards the encountered native. Whereas the Native-American population at well under two million is but 0.6-to-0.7% of our total population, Native-Americans were reported to be 3.8% of the total prison inmate population in 1990 (Camp & Camp, 1990, p. 5). Proportionally speaking, Native-

Americans find themselves as inmates at nearly six times the rate that they find themselves citizens.

By the 1970s, Native-American prison inmates—at the bottom of all statistical charts registering their social, health, and educational levels—were the most neglected group, despite the constant study by researchers of Native-American programs and services. All the factors that contributed to the collective dismay of the Native-American population outside of prison complicated and made worse the plight of Native-Americans in prison. Efforts by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other federal agencies were unavailing. A program of cultural literacy, discussion groups, cultural exchanges with fellow inmates at San Quentin (in California) in the 1960s, led to a reduction of problems for the Indian inmates who became involved in the educational program, but violence at San Quentin in 1973 caused the program to be discontinued (Nordwall, 1974).

A lawsuit in Nebraska resulted in the late-1970s in the establishment of the Cheyenne River Swift Bird Project, a Native-American rehabilitation facility, and the elaboration of two kinds of correctional programs: correctional institutions exclusively for Indians (a "correctional reservation" approach) and "prison survival schools" for Indians incarcerated within larger, non-Native populations, with the goals of developing a sense of Native-American self-worth, basic skills, and cultural literacy in both the dominant American culture and the marginalized Native culture (French, 1981). Alaska, which at 30% has the highest percentage of Native-American prison inmates (Camp & Camp, 990, p. 4), also mounts the most thorough attempt at prison education of Native-Americans, although some notable programs exist in other states as well.[3] We found that studies and descriptions of literacy programs for Native-Americans are even more elusive than research on incarcerated Hispanics.

5. WOMEN

Women in prison—traditionally viewed as *fallen women*—have in history been treated in some ways worse than men. Housed in the same buildings as the men, women thereby oftentimes became sexual prey, or they were put in the attic or in the cellar. When they did not spend their time in enforced inactivity and silence, they fulfilled domestic duties, washing and sewing for themselves and for the men, doing what they would have done in the male-dominant society had they not been in prison (Callahan, 1987).

In 1990, women constituted 7% of the federal prison population; 3.1% of the state prison population in Maine, and 9.1% in Wyoming; and 5.6% for the overall average in America's prisons, having increased at a more rapid rate than that of males since 1981 (Camp & Camp, 1990, pp. 4-5; Bessette, 1989). Because of their minority status in prisons and jails, however, and because of traditional gender chauvinism (that women don't need vocational training or education), educational and other services for incarcerated women have been slow to develop. In many places, programs are still wholly inadequate. For example, even though lack of jobs skills is one of the most serious problems faced by female inmates, in 1978 women's prisons offered an average of 2.7 vocational training programs compared to 10 in male institutions (Chapman, 1978). Over the past two decades, the situation has improved in large part due to women inmates' taking it upon themselves to engage in lawsuits in order to obtain equitable treatment (U.S. Comptroller General, 1980; Kittredge, 1991).[4] In some states, the situation is positive and hopeful. Indiana Women's Prison, for example, the prison with which we are most familiar, already has an extensive educational program, and the potential of becoming a *secure school.*

Ryan's comprehensive study of 58 prisons and other correctional facilities in which women were incarcerated yielded the following profile:

- 62% of the women were under 30 years old; 55% were 20 to 29 years old
- 38% were African-American; 50% were Caucasian (whereas in 1975, 50% had been African-American, and 38% had been Caucasian).

Educationally, the following situation prevailed:

- 58% had less than high school
- 33% had high school or the equivalent
- 7% had some post-secondary education (whereas in 1975, 16% had some post-secondary education)
- 83% of the prisons had ABE programs (up from 60% in 1973), but only 11% of the women were enrolled
- 88% of the prisons had GED programs (up from 67% in 1973), but only 9% of the women were enrolled
- 83% of the prisons had vocational education, and 18% of the women were enrolled

- 72% of the prisons surveyed offered post-secondary courses (up from 53% in 1975), and the percentages of women taking these courses ranged from 1% to 15%
- 10% of the women worked in prison industries. (Ryan, 1983)

Other studies with similar results yield the following profile of women in prison:

- under 30
- undereducated
- with undeveloped work and other functional skills
- single parents
- as often a woman of color as white
- becoming collectively less and less literate. (Sorenson, 1981; Valenta & Decostanzo, 1982)

African-American and Hispanic women are often women with the poorest educations. The low-education factor accounts for the ethnicity areas of functional incompetency reflected in APL tests (Whitson, 1977b).

Studies conducted at various institutions where educational services for women have been improved showed, among other results, that when women inmates, especially African-Americans, take advantage of self-improvement courses, their educational involvement correlates with a reduction of the length of time in jail (Rankin & Haugerud, 1976; Chapman, 1978; Valente & Decostanzo, 1982; Foster, n/d). Unfortunately, as clear as is the connection between low levels of functional competency and the great need for education, functionally incompetent women are sometimes slow to take advantage of their educational opportunities in prison (Whitson, 1977b).

Female inmates are different educationally from males. Prison educators who have educated both genders gossip that teaching in a women's prison is easier than teaching in a men's prison: the women are more civilized. At the same time, some women inmates who want to think of themselves as equal to men in every way, claim to be as tough, and those women probably are: "They can't say we don't have fights in here; us females are worse than men. It's PMS every day!"—Francine Prim, 27, African-American, forger (Kittredge, 1991). Nevertheless, whereas men typically are incarcerated for intentional crimes of violence—rape, murder, and armed robbery—women typically are imprisoned for negligent manslaughter, larceny, fraud, and drug offenses (Besette, 1989, p.

37), and women frequently commit their crimes with, or on behalf of, men (Champman, 1978). Many incarcerated women demonstrate a rather romantic, sentimental side, remembering childhood as the happiest time in their lives, placing a high priority on having a happy home life, coming from actively religious backgrounds, but all of this unsupported by education to such an extent that their nostalgia for desired goals is strongly inconsistent with their near-vacuum of ideas, plans, and actions that might enable them to achieve their objectives (Mebane, 1976). Women inmates' reading preferences for romance novels, adventure stories, and humor, but also literature about prisons and prisoners, accords with their tendencies to be romantic, passive, dependent, religious, and unrealistic about life.[5] Economically disadvantaged on account of their gender, women need instruction in life-coping skills; in the humanities that sustain the female tradition and experience; and in independence and social responsibility, self-sufficiency, self-reliance, self-worth, and self-preservation (Chapman, 1978; Ryan, 1979; Vicinus & Kinnard, 1980).

6. THE EDUCATIONALLY DISABLED

By "educationally disabled" we refer to the educational needs of that group of people ranging from mildly to severely restricted, whom different observers designate as low I.Q., deficient, retarded, functionally retarded, learning disabled, special, handicapped, confused, slow, and who have a wide variety of impairments such as hyperactivity, impulsivity, awkwardness, destructiveness, short attention span, and specific learning problems related to motor-perceptual difficulties (Post, 1981).[6] The national statistics available on this broad grouping leave the educator dissatisfied. No precise numbers are available, but estimates ranging from 25% to 40% have been made of the number of mentally disadvantaged individuals scattered among ordinary inmates (Fox, 1987, p. 8; Bell, R., et al., 1979, p. 1; Dennison, 1979; Illinois State Advisory Council, 1983; Gold, 1983). According to an estimate predicated on statistics about the federal prison system, 13% of the inmates are of below-average intelligence, 37% are above average, and 50% are average (Changing Times, 1976). These numbers for the elite federal system do not tell the tale for the state institutions; probably as many as 50% of juvenile offenders are educationally disabled (Garfunkel, 1986). One of the most useful descriptions of the educationally disabled within the prison system is the official guide for correctional administrators (Coffey, et al, 1989).

28

A most insightful study of "learning deficiencies" among inmates was conducted by Lehigh University on a sample basis in nine prisons, three each in Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington. (One deficit of this selective approach was that no prison population among these nine had a high percentage of Hispanic inmates.) Some of the results of the Lehigh study, briefly stated, are as follows:

- 55% were African-American (African-Americans seemed to suffer educational disability at over twice the rate of African-American representation within the general population)
- 50% had never been employed or had been unsteadily employed
- 84% of the 50% who had been employed had been laborers or semi-skilled workers
- Almost 70% (of those for whom information was available) came from unstable childhood home environments
- 50% of the people had experienced some type of severe childhood problem
- 19% reported drug abuse, or a combination of drug and alcohol abuse, as their childhood's problem
- 43% reported themselves to have been in trouble with the law when they were juveniles; official institutional records reported a more likely figure of 60%
- 68% were incarcerated because of violent crimes, and "the level of violence tends to increase as the inmate gets older and his or her contact with the criminal justice system continues" (Bell, Conard, Gazze, Greenwood, Lutz, & Suppa, 1983, p. 67)
- An 86 I.Q. was the average, or "almost one standard deviation below national norms on the WAIS-R. There are clear indications of ethnic and state differences which are consistent with national findings. Dramatic differences (14 points or one standard deviation) exist between the learning deficient and the non-learning deficient inmates in the sample...." (Bell, Conard, Gazze, Greenwood, Lutz, & Suppa, 1983, p. 68)
- 21% of those scoring below an I.Q. of 75 scored on the Adaptive Behavior Checklist (a redesigned version of the AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale) in a range to indicate problems with adaptive behavior

Further results of the Lehigh study in terms of educational variables were as follows:

- mean highest grade completed: 10th grade
- 6% had never gotten beyond elementary school (on 50% of the sample for whom information was available)
- 16% had been placed in "special education" programs in elementary school (33% of the "learning-deficient" inmates)
- 20% had been placed in "special education" programs in secondary school (39% of the "learning-deficient" inmates)
- 4% had been identified as "learning disabled"
- 14% had been identified as "socially and emotionally disturbed"
- 82% had been identified according to other categories, including "mentally retarded and/or brain damaged"
- 6.7% registered on the TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education) with more than three years below the average highest grade reported for the sample, with "clear indications of ethnic and state differences in the area of academic achievement."
- 42% at or below the fifth-grade level on one or more TABE subtests
- 82% (of those who scored at or below the fifth-grade level according to the TABE)—a "startling and dramatic" finding—had disability problems (according to the Mann-Suiter Learning Disabilities Screening Tests): most commonly, visual memory, visual closure, auditory closure, auditory discrimination

The results of this study caused the researchers to conclude that there is a disproportional representation of African-Americans among educationally disabled inmates, and that "the interactive effect of socio-economic background, unstable childhood home, and the incidence of specific learning disabilities...may be the single most important determiner of anti-social behavior which results in eventual contact with the criminal justice system" (Bell, Conard, Gazze, Greenwood, Lutz, & Suppa, 1983, p. 70-74; Bell, Conard, & Suppa, 1984).

Speculating on the basis of our own limited experience, and informed by some passive figures in a statistical chart, we find ourselves knocking on a closed door (Camp & Camp, 1990, p. 40). The least able and most defenseless are crowded together with the predatory and vicious. Prisonization and criminalization result (McMahon, 1986; Keilitz & Dunivant, 1986; Grande & Koorland, 1988). Most states report the numbers of inmates enrolled in mental health and sex-offender programs, although a few states did not report their statistics for 1990 in these categories. Some states with large inmate populations (over 10,000) have relatively high numbers of inmates enrolled in these programs. Ohio, for example, with 30,541 inmates in all institutions, reported that 3,000 of these were in mental-health programs, and 250 were in sex-offender programs. Other states, however, (Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia) indicated tiny enrollments in such programs. For three examples, Oklahoma, with 11,608 inmates in all institutions, reported that only 74 individuals were enrolled in mental health programs, and 29 were in sex-offender programs. New York, with 51,227 people in prison, reported that only 845 and 310 of these were enrolled in these special programs, respectively. The District of Columbia, with 12,104 inmates, reported 276 in mental programs and nobody in a sex-offender program.

We do not suggest that educationally disabled people necessarily suffer from mental-health disorders, but in the murk of non-specificity that clouds reported statistics, one can be relatively certain that these numbers involve more than a little overlap. Many educationally disabled people are mentally unhealthy and behaviorally disordered, and many mentally unhealthy and behaviorally disordered people are educationally disabled (Kazar, 1987). We may certainly conclude the likelihood that public policy on the education of the disabled—as expressed in the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, the 1975 Education of All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), and the 1984 Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524)—is being selectively obeyed from state to state, as has been noted and criticized more than once.[7]

Arguments (and sometimes justification) for the widespread neglect of the educationally disabled in the prisons and for non-compliance with the laws designed to protect the educationally disabled are predictable: (1) it is unreasonable to expect the corrections system to provide the expensive, individualized, highly specialized education for this large population; (2) trained staff are in short supply; (3) there is a high turnover rate among the highly mobile inmate population, making it difficult to educate them, and there is little interagency cooperation; (4) the several states' laws vary affecting education of the disabled, and, similarly, standards vary from institution to institution; (5) the educationally disabled are difficult to identify and track; (6) educational efforts in prisons typically fail to be correlated with neighboring educational programs and standards; and (7) administrative requirements for this kind of education tend to be top-heavy (Price & Vitolo, 1985; Grande & Koorland, 1988). Because of the difficulties in identifying the learning disabled, educators in the private sector are even more so advised to accept the challenge of caring (McMahon, 1986; Leone, 1987; Grande & Koorland, 1988).

The connection between educational disability and delinquency in youths is not a simple one. Learning-disabled youths do not engage in more delinquent activity than do non-learning-disabled juveniles, although learning-disabled youths are twice as likely to run amok of the juvenile justice system. Opposite to the tendency to *mainstream* the learning-disabled in the public-school setting, the learning-disabled in prisons need to be sentenced to *alternative education* programs where they will be protected and where their habilitation can take place through individualized education (Hawkins & Wall, 1980; Rector, 1981; Haberman & Quinn, 1986; Garrison, 1987).

Educationally disabled people need literacy education (and other forms of humane help) in proportion to their greater difficulties with basic reading and writing, but they benefit more, relatively speaking, than do others when they are properly educated, and otherwise kindly treated (Devlin, et al., 1984; Larson & Gerber, 1987; Everington & Luckasson, 1989). Application of Feuerstein's Learning Potential Assessment Device in a study of inmates' "cognitive modifiability" demonstrated that low-achievers' past failures to learn, even when one is a convicted criminal, is no necessary indicator of inability to learn in the present (Waksman, Silverman, Weber, 1983; Platt, Wienke, & Tunick, 1982; Ayers, 1979; ECS, 1976; Thompson, 1979; Bell, R., et al., 1979, 1983). Thoughtful educators have discussed the needs and described the characteristics of educationally disabled inmates with special attention to preparing prison educators for this special task,[8] have elaborated procedures by which the laws could be obeyed and the educational needs of the special inmate population be met, and have devised successful programs for the educationally disabled (*Program Suggestions...in Michigan*, 1982; Pasternack & Lyon, 1982; Mesinger, 1984b; Wolford, 1983a & b, 1987).[9]

Educationally disabled inmates need not only special education but also a special invitation to take advantage of prison education. Inmates with low reading levels and average-to-above-average IQ scores are statistically less likely to enroll in basic education courses than are inmates with low reading levels and low IQ scores, but both classes of inmates need encouragement to enroll in habilitative programs (Shinbaum, 1977).

D. THE BACKGROUND OF PRISON LITERACY

1. A HISTORY OF REFORM AND REHABILITATION

The first recorded instance of education that took place inside an American prison offers a parable for the present. The Rev. William Rogers announced that he would conduct services at Walnut Street Prison in Philadelphia and that he would give instruction to the inmates. The anxious prison authorities, fearful of a breach in security, moved a cannon into the jail, mounted it beside the pulpit, aimed it directly at the prisoners, and stationed beside it a guard with a lighted torch ready to ignite the piece at the first indication of prison riot.[10]

The history of education in prisons and jails in America continues to be a snarl of problems that have not been resolved (Bell, Conrad, Laffey, Lutz, Miller, Simon, & Stakelon, 1979; Horvath, 1982). As Lucas states, "In general, prison education has been historically loose and fragmented and essentially married to the prevailing local prison administration" (Lucas, 1985, p. 1). Nevertheless, a strong current of reform in prison education has been steadily growing in America since the beginning of the 19th century.

In 1801, elementary education was offered at New York's Newgate Prison for the "meritorious." The earliest extant record of prison education in New York State enshrined a testament to Bible literacy in the Session Laws of 1822: "It shall be lawful...to furnish a Bible for each prisoner confined in a solitary cell" (*Laws of New York*, 1822, chapter CCLXXIII, Section III). This privilege was extended to all inmates in 1829: "It shall be the duty of the agents to furnish, at the expense of the State, a Bible to each convict confined in their respective prisons, who can read" (*Laws of New York*, Revised Statutes, Part IV, Chapter III, Title 2, Section 58). The chaplain was the only person with a book that many inmates ever saw. By 1825, the Boston Prison Discipline Society had established Sunday schools in the houses of correction, offering both sacred and secular instruction. Following an attempt in New York State, in 1826, to ascertain how many illiterates were incarcerated, the Rev. Jared Curtis founded the Prison Sabbath School, and in 1827, he became the first resident chaplain at an American prison, in Auburn, New York. Curtis divided his school of illiterate convicts, all of them under 25 years of age, into small groups, and he enlisted volunteer theological students to instruct them (Kangisser, 1985). In 1829, new legislation in Kentucky required prison wardens to sanctify four hours every Sunday for instruction of the inmates in reading, writing, and ciphering (Wines & Dwight, 1867). During the progressive era of the 1830s, education of inmates began to be more widespread. Maryland established the first school system for all prisoners during this decade (Tappan, 1960, p. 690). By the mid-1800s, the Latter-Day Saints in Utah were operating a school in the territorial prison where classes were held every day, including Sundays (Timmins, 1989).

In 1846, the first prison library in New York State was established at Sing Sing (*Laws of New York*, 1846, Chapter 324, Section 7). In 1847, the library allowance was increased, as was its use; and both vocational and correctional education were also established in New York State, the first prison system to employ full-time, paid teachers of inmates (Wallack, et al., 1939).

> *[The prison agent shall] select, as far as practicable, such persons in appointing keepers to each prison, where manufacturing is carried on by the state, as are qualified to instruct the convicts in the trades and manufactures thus prosecuted in such prison.*
>
> *Two instructors shall be appointed by the board of inspectors for each of the prisons...; it shall be the duty of such instructors with, and under the supervision of, the chaplain to give instruction in the useful branches of an English education to such convicts as, in the judgment of the warden or the chaplain, may require the same and be benefited by it; such instruction shall be given for not less than one hour and a half daily, Sunday excepted, between the hours of six and nine in the evening (Laws of New York, 1847, Chapter 460, Title II, Article I, Section 34, Subdivision 15; Paragraph 61).*

The strongest influence for reform of American prisons came from Australia by way of England and Ireland. In the early 1840s in a prison in Norfolk Island, off the coast of Australia, Alexander Maconochie established a *mark system*, which included such correctional novelties as indeterminate sentencing, progressive housing, classification, use of peer pressure to facilitate reformation, rehabilitative programs, inmates' direct contact with the warden instead of through intermediaries, and "softening elements" (music and gardens). Inmates could earn credits or marks towards early release through honest work, good conduct, vocational education towards post-release productivity, and study. Maconochie staffed his adult schools with educated convicts, and he rewarded prisoners with achievement prizes for reading aloud in the segregation unit, hospitals, dormitories, and larger houses. He also founded a library in the prison (Barry, 1958; Barnes & Teeters, 1959; Conrad, 1965; Gehring & Muth, 1985).

Galord Hubbells, the warden at Sing Sing, visited reformed prisons in England and Ireland in 1863, and he brought the prison reform message home to America to be incorporated into a concept that would become known as the *Elmira system,* because it typified the approach established in 1876, by Zebulon Brockway, used at the Elmira Reformatory in New York. Prisons began to be redefined not as places of punishment for sins committed against society, but as places in which a reformation of morals and mind might take place through industrious occupation in physical work and vocational training and demonstration of correction through specific performance (Angle, 1982; Sutton, 1983).

In the wave of progressivism that followed the War between the States, other prison systems evolved. In 1867, E. C. Wines, a leader of the Prison Association of New York, supported Gideon Haynes, warden of the Massachusetts State Prison, in sponsoring educational lectures several times monthly. In 1868, the Massachusetts Assembly approved this new departure with an allocation of $1,000 for the purchase of schoolbooks to be used in teaching illiterate inmates in twice-weekly classes.

By 1871, Zebulon Brockway, who had determined to turn the Detroit House of Detention into a school, had two-thirds of his inmates attending classes not only in basic literacy instruction but also in "formal academic, vocational, and social education" (Angle, 1982). Brockway experimented in social education, constructed separate facilities for females (the House of Shelter), and "drew a well-trained faculty from public schools, colleges, and the professions" (Gehring & Muth, 1985, p. 145). Brockway continued these policies when Elmira was founded and where he remained the superintendent until 1900 (McKelvey, 1936; Gehring & Muth, 1985).

At Elmira, Brockway implemented most of the programs he had established at the Detroit House of Corrections, and many more. He obtained private resources for an excellent library; built a big school and a separate trade school; established extensive academic, vocational, social, and postsecondary programs; constructed a large lecture/concert hall and a huge gymnasium for physical education, complete with marble hot and cold baths and facilities for physical therapy; brought in the best artists and speakers for weekly cultural programs; experimented continuously in special school programs for handicapped learners—including individualized physician-prescribed diets and calisthenics; hired only the most qualified and best-trained, full-time teachers; started the first inmate newspaper in the U.S.; provided some post-release placement services and several well-documented follow-up studies; and generally used the entire institutional programming effort to further educational aims. Brockway was a real professional as a prison educator (Gehring & Muth, 1985, p. 145-6).

Wines, Brockway, and their growing alliance of prison reformers formed the National Prison Association (later, American Correctional Association), and they held their first congress in 1870, under the presidency of Judge Rutherford B. Hayes, in Cincinnati. There, H. S. Tarbell enunciated the first principles of education in prisons:

> *To give to the inmates of our prisons higher thoughts, increased acquisitions, and desires for a better life, is the object of the prison school....The most important element in the whole arrangement is a suitable teacher....He must be a painstaking, consistent, steadfast man, of so much character and scholarship as to secure the respect and confidence of the prisoners. There must be no sham, no mere assumption about him; for all shrewd observers of men and motives, of all lynx-eyed detectors of hum-bug and affectation, the inmates of our prisons are the sharpest. (Tarbell, 1870, p. 1940; cited in Wallack, 1939, pp. 7-8)*

The National Prison Association (NPA) set forth two ideals: each inmate's human individuality requires specialized attention, and each inmate's potential to become a good citizen ought to be fostered. The NPA announced prison education to be a part of its "Declaration of Principles":

> *Education is a vital force in the reformation of fallen men and women. Its tendency is to quicken the intellect, inspire self-respect, excite to higher aims, and afford a healthful substitute for low and vicious amusements. Education is, therefore, a matter of primary importance in prisons, and should be carried to the utmost extent consistent with the other purposes of such institutions. (Tarbell, 1870)*

Two years later, Brockway attended the First International Penitentiary Congress, held in London, and he addressed the gathering:

> *The educational effort in prisons, if made efficient for reformation, must be well and thoroughly organized. No slate-and-pencil arrangement, with the teacher at the cell-door occasionally, but a veritable school congregated, graded, and divided into classes....The higher branches of study should be introduced, and inducements offered to young, capable men to prepare themselves for particular spheres of activity, even the learned professions. (Brockway, 1872, p. 648f; cited in Wallack, 1939, p. 7)*

After Elmira, the tide of prison-education reform ebbed and flowed as eras of progressivism were interspersed with eras of reaction. One experiment in correctional education in a Florida state prison lasted until 1878 and the end of Reconstruction (Roberts, 1989). By the 1880s, secondary school programs, largely via correspondence courses, were being offered in some prisons (Grattan, 1959). Following 1909, Homer Lane's Boys' Home (now "Boys Republic") in Farmington Hills, Michigan, exemplified the ideal educational reformatory for juvenile offenders; it was a school of self-respect, self-reliance, and self-restraint through self-government, although in the years following Lane's administration, the original educative approach was supplanted by a therapeutic paradigm (Clatworthy, 1982). In 1915, Thomas Mott Osborne—a disciple of Brockway, reformer of Sing Sing, and founder of the Mutual Welfare League (a self-rule organization to manage inmate society)—was indicted on trumped-up charges of "going soft" on prisoners Lucas, 1985; Muth & Gehring, 1986). Between 1912 and 1920, Fred Nelles, supervisor of the Whittier State School for Boys during the enlightened governorship of Hiram Johnson of California, changed the emphasis of the prison program from institutional maintenance to academic and, especially, vocational education. The prison to Nelles was a reformatory for "providing special education for unusually needy 'students,' not punishing legally processed criminals" (Schlossman, 1983, p. 28).

In 1927–28, Austin MacCormick, acting on behalf of the Committee on Education of the American Prison Association, surveyed 110 of the 114 state and federal prisons, their adult educational programs, and their libraries. MacCormick's was the first such review of the state of the prisons to be undertaken in America. As well as state and federal prisons and male and female reformatories, MacCormick also visited road gangs and prison farms. His published report, *The Education of Adult Prisoners*, became the first benchmark in professional correctional education and a manifesto for prison literacy. MacCormick concluded that there was "not a single complete and well-rounded educational program adequately financed and staffed" in any American prison at the beginning of the decade of the 1930s (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 11-12; Horvath, 1982).

Most significantly for prison literacy, MacCormick's and others' work led in 1946 to the founding of the Correctional Education Association (CEA). The CEA became, and remains, the professional association of prison educators and the publisher of its *Journal of Correctional Education*. By sustaining and enhancing the professional role of educators in prisons, the CEA, more than any other institution, has fostered the literacy of prison inmates (Muth & Gehring, 1986, p. 16; Osborne, 1916; Chamberlain, 1935; Evans, 1978).

As bad as the situation was in the early 1930s, MacCormick saw signs of improving conditions in prison education. He named several states in which education and libraries were being improved; he remarked that the Federal Bureau of Prisons had established a division responsible for education and libraries and that the Committee on Institutional Libraries of the American Library Association and the Committee on Education of the American Prison Association were taking the lead "vigorously to stimulate educational and library work" (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 12-13). The widely disseminated *Prison Library Handbook* (1932) was the first attempt to describe standard library practice applicable to correctional institutions.

Over the next generation, the initiatives grew, fostered by efforts like those of the Commission on Education in Correctional Institutions in the State of New York, which published its *Aims and Objectives of Education in Correctional Institutions* (Wallack, 1939; Ryan, 1977). In 1934, the Utah State Prison School was offering 22 classes under a very schoolish-sounding daily schedule (from 8:15 a.m. to 3:25 p.m.), taught by a faculty of seven. Students in the English classes had begun publication of the first-ever inmate-produced newspaper, *The Penwiper*, which continued to be published until it was interrupted by World War II (Timmins, 1989). During the time of FDR's "New Deal," the Works Progress Administration funded jobs for numerous unemployed teachers as instructors in state prisons.

By the 1960s, unevenness in prison education was the norm. Speaking favorably of some state and federal programs, but not of all, Paul Tappan summarized the situation of inmate literacy in 1960, as follows:

> *Formal academic education is provided in some prisons at several levels. Illiteracy, defined as performance at less than the fourth-grade level, prevails among about 30% of those offenders admitted to prison. Remedying this condition is one of the basic and challenging tasks of correctional education. Prisoners are often pathetically pleased when they learn to read letters from home and to write them. (Tappan, 1960, p. 690)*

In the absence of adequate statistical studies, Tappan went on to estimate that another 30% of inmates had completed the seventh or eighth grades, and 10% were high-school graduates; less than 1% had graduated from college. Tappan noted the variations in prison attempts to provide supplementary training through classes and cell-study correspondence courses.

By the time of the Johnson administration's Great Society in the mid-1960s, American opinion was ripe for a massive infusion of federal energy in the expansion of prison education. A number of modern and liberal and rather optimistic ideas had come into their own: behaviorism as a theory of personality modification; vocational education and programmed instruction, and other experimental approaches to social remediation; sociology as a scientific way to explain human motivations; and therapeutic psychology and counseling as a scientific way of healing motivations gone wrong.

A glance at statistics demonstrates the changes wrought in prison education in the aftermath of the Great Society. In 1966, in 27 of 55 prison systems nationwide, post-secondary studies were still being done mostly by correspondence, the preferred style of a former era; 17 systems offered extension courses, 3 offered televised instruction, and 3 had study-release programs; none offered the possibility of a baccalaureate degree. One year later, seven state prisons offered inmates an associate's degree from junior colleges. By 1971, post-secondary programs were available in 121 prisons; by 1975, federal prisoners had completed 9,000 college-level courses, including the completion of 158 associate, 19 baccalaureate, and two master's degrees. By 1980, the number of prisons offering college programs had risen to 300 (McCollum, 1975).

At the same time, prison teachers, formerly most often chaplains or volunteers, became professionalized (Pecht, 1983). Correctional education "emerge[d] as a unique subset of the educational profession," as seven states put education in prisons under the joint direction of the Department of Corrections (Coffey, 1982, p. 11) and the State Department of Education. Universities began to offer graduate programs to train correctional educators (Gehring & Clark, 1979).

2. PUBLIC POLICY SINCE THE GREAT SOCIETY

The aftermath of the Great Society was also an important time for judicial reform of prison education. Nevertheless, the uneven development of public and legal policy regarding the incarcerated has proceeded (in the telling phrase of the District Judge, who in *Holt v. Sarver* would like to have ruled in favor of inmates' right to rehabilitation) on the basis of the "ripening of sociology," a sociology which in America is still half-green.

> *This court knows that a sociological theory or idea may ripen into constitutional law; many such theories have done so. But, this Court is not prepared to say that such a ripening has occurred as yet as far as rehabilitation is concerned.*[11]

Legal theory has evolved from an extreme of judicial harshness (the court's definition of inmates in Virginia as "slaves of the state," [*Ruffin v. Commonwealth*, 1871]) to the theories of *natural rights*, and to the theory of *social contract*; from the notion of civil rights *entitlement*, and to the judicial reform of prison education now taking the lead.[12] The prevalent theory now seems to be one of moral action premised on humanitarianism, which, if it can make common cause with the prevalent conservative theory of cost-effective utilitarianism, may be able to deliver education to the prisons on the promise of civilizing inmates, causing prisons to run more smoothly, and reducing recidivism (Pierce & Mason, 1976, p. ii). The emerging theory of corrections, *alternative sentencing*, will have even greater implications for education as more and more adjudicated persons are monitored by the courts outside of traditional prisons (International Conference on Penal Abolition V, 1991). The legislative and judicial impulses of the Great Society speeded up the "ripening of sociology" into the harvest of educational efforts in prisons and jails that we are now beginning to reap.[13]

Judicial decisions have been ambiguous, and they leave us with a collection of half-ripe inmates' rights, ranging from the promise

40

that "a prisoner is not stripped of his constitutional rights when he enters the prison gate" and "when a prison regulation or practice offends a fundamental constitutional guarantee, federal courts will discharge their duty to protect constitutional rights" (*Procunier v. Martinez*), to the far less comforting double-negative statement that "a prisoner retains only those First Amendment rights that are not inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system" (*Hamilton v. Saxbe*). A parallel ambiguity prevails with respect to prison education, offering with one hand that "convicts and the general public are entitled to the same rights" (*Morales v. Schmidt*), while taking away with the other hand:"Persons convicted of felonies do not acquire by virtue of their convictions, constitutional rights to services and benefits that are not available to persons never convicted of criminal offenses" (*Four Unnamed Plaintiffs v. Hall*).[14]

Continuing the ambiguity, some rights have been secured; others have not. As yet, the courts have not, or not quite, guaranteed a "right to (re)habilitation,"[15] though that elaboration may be forthcoming by analogy to the issue of medical treatment, in which case inmates may have greater rights than do free citizens.[16] Other rights with implications for literacy have, however, been secured to inmates by the courts,[17] such as the right of access to legal information and the right not to remain illiterate.[18]

One of the hopeful signs in the reformation of prison education is the interest that sitting judges and lawyers—people in a position to know about prison conditions—are now taking, e.g. the National Judicial Conference on Literacy in 1991, co-hosted by the Special Committee on Law and Literacy of the American Bar Association and the National Judicial College. In addition, the suggestion first made by Chief Justice Warren Burger that literacy be required for inmates eventually became the mandatory adult basic education policy of the federal Bureau of Prisons, namely, as amended, 12th-grade literacy and completion of the GED.[19] Contrary signs have been the cutbacks in social services in recent administrations and conservative forces in the Congress seeking to thwart the education of prison inmates at the public's expense. More than 65% of the financial aid available to inmate-students comes in the form of PELL grants, a federal program, but a Congressional movement, led by Senator Jesse Helms, to terminate this aspect of the PELL legislation, has been growing in power.[20]

Correctional educational laws and policies differ in all 50 states. In 1975, Texas was debating inmates' legal *right to treatment* and *right to education*, especially literacy education (*Right to* *treatment/Right to an education*, 1975). Many reports have been made about state efforts to reform prison education policy and practice. Full documentation on the legislative bills, legal actions, and court decisions regarding inmates' educational rights are so numerous that even a list of these would overwhelm this brief survey.[21]

There are, however, a number of summary sources on contemporary legal issues in prison literacy. The Correctional Educational Association published a guide to action for prison literacy lobbyists (Correctional Education Association, 1983). Richard Crane writes a monthly "Legal Issues" column in *Corrections Compendium*, which also publishes updates of prison-education related legal and other matters. *Pep Talk*, a new "information exchange for prison education programs" now in its second year of publication at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst), also informs on legal issues requiring informed action by those concerned about prison education. A state-of-the-art report currently being prepared for the proposed new Clearinghouse on Correctional Education will undoubtedly bring us up-to-date on this matter.

Since the mid-1960s there have been vast amounts of prison literacy reports, studies, handbooks, and journals, and elaboration of more theories about, and proposals for, correctional education than ever before. This abundance of scholarship and opinion reflects the new era of heightened consciousness about prison reform and correctional education that dawned with the Great Society (Ryan, 1971; Roberts, 1971, 1973; Gaither, 1982).

E. ILLITERACY AND CRIMINALITY: LITERACY IS A WAY OUT

Just as illiteracy and criminality are connected, so also in inverse proportion, growth in literacy and a decline in criminality are likewise connected. Among the few results of learned studies that can be considered definitive and final, the one which might well be thought of as the "first law of prison literacy" is that a pronounced and direct relationship exists between insufficient literacy and unsociable behavior (Palfrey, 1974). Studies in the United Kingdom (Dalglish, 1979, 1983), Canada (Ross, 1978), and the United States (Walton, 1987), all demonstrate the umbilical connection between the rate of functional inability to read, write, and cipher adequately, and the inability of the educationally disadvantaged to live within the legal norms of North Atlantic society (Roberts & Coffey, 1976; Ross, 1977).

The case is clear for the relationship between illiteracy and criminality in adult inmates, but it is even clearer in juveniles, with whom fewer complicating factors (such as the debilitating effects of life in prison) need to be controlled for. The inadequately literate adult inmate was himself once an illiterate and probably delinquent youth whom family, church, school, and society failed to educate for a wide range of nearly unmanageable reasons.[22] Socio-economically speaking, the juvenile delinquent is merely the younger brother of his older inmate counterpart.[23] When, however, juveniles' educational deficits are corrected in time, i.e., before youthful and emotionally underaged offenders are sent to prison, "enrolled in Crime College," and apprenticed to seasoned perpetrators in a graduate course on how to be a criminal, their rate of turnaround is gratifyingly high. A school for prevention is better than a prison full of correction.[24]

Many of the same studies that confirm the criminality/illiteracy connection also indicate a correlation between growing literacy and diminishing criminal behavior among juveniles for whom intervention to increase their literacy rate was swift and effective. Juveniles are more predictable as recidivists, and they are easier to educate and correct than are adult inmates, even in cases when the juveniles are educationally disabled.[25]

Not literacy alone, but the "right kind" of literacy instruction, especially where the parents become supportive,[26] is the knock-out punch against juvenile crime.[27] The *right kind* of instruction, as revealed in these studies, can be summarized as early-intervention, individualized, small-class, closely monitored, culturally responsive, success-oriented, highly motivating, self-esteem-building instruction that is delivered by caring and competent, well-trained and dedicated, street-wise and savvy teachers and counselors (Leone, 1986; van Nagel, et al., 1986; *Educational services for jailed youth*, 1982; Pasternack, 1988).

Programs for juvenile delinquents have needed to improve, and, where there were money and good will, they have improved over the past decade.[28] Where these are lacking, however, temporarily incarcerated juveniles still go for weeks and months without the help in the form of education that they need the most not to become hardened criminals (Roush, 1983; Webb & Maddox, 1986; Pasternack, 1988). With nothing better to do than watch a television or look at a used magazine, a detained young person is deprived of contact with someone interested in the development of his or her mind (Rutherford & Bower, 1976; Webb & Maddox, 1986; Dell'Apa, 1973). Despite a near-universal awareness of education's high potential for habilitative success among juvenile offenders, in very many situations—especially local jails—the laws mandating educative remediation are being ignored. The special characteristics of juvenile detention that make education difficult—especially short-term stays in detention centers, and high mobility—are offered in excuse for the waste of time that could have been spent in effective habilitation. Educationally disabled juveniles in many institutions are among our poorest served inmates (Rutherford & Bower, 1976; Webb & Maddox, 1986; Dell'Apa, 1973).

Including many of the references already cited, we found many studies of successful literacy instruction of juvenile inmates that indicated the habilitating effects of greater literacy to reduce criminal behavior (*North Carolina*, 1979; Cei, 1983; McCord & Sanches, 1983; Gowen, 1984; Spellacy & Brown, 1984; Greenwood & Zimring, 1985; Greenwood, 1985; Ingram, 1985; Janosik, 1985; Grenier & Roundtree, 1987). Literacy and other educational programs for juveniles are numerous enough to have evoked a number of studies that compare several programs.[29]

A single concrete example speaks for all. In a study of 759 youths released from Wisconsin's two juvenile correctional institutions during 1979, when school transcripts were perused and parole officers were consulted, it was discovered that only 3% of the delinquent juveniles had completed a traditional high-school program before incarceration; their reading and math test scores

44

indicated a range of abilities that dipped far too low. While incarcerated, 40% of them earned a GED. After release over the next three years, 19% of them (145 people) were imprisoned as adults; of these, 60% had not completed high school or earned the GED. The right kind of education helped keep many of the people in this group from recidivating (Pawasarat, et al., 1982).

1. RECIDIVISM, EDUCATION, AND THE ADULT OFFENDER

Recidivism refers to released offenders' returning to prison for having committed new crimes. When former inmates commit new crimes and return to custody, imprisonment as *correction* has failed because demonstrably insufficient changes were wrought while the criminal was in prison. The quest is for a means to reduce recidivism by increasing success with correction. Recidivism in relation to various correctional measures—literacy instruction and other forms of education—is perhaps the most studied aspect of correctional rehabilitation in general.

Study after study has confirmed low-level literacy among criminal recidivists. Recidivists begin their criminal careers earlier than do non-recidivists, they show greater degrees of hostility and non-conformity (apart from, and unrelated to, the effects that being in prison may have on them), and—although they have the same general intelligence level as non-recidivists—they make lower scores in reading and arithmetic. Recidivists whose test results show exceptionally low reading scores also demonstrate a significant relationship between their illiteracy and their habitual recidivism.[30]

The effects of the criminality/illiteracy connection, tangled in the web of other factors, operate to send people to prison early in life; and then, after they are released, this connection continues in effect to involve them in rearrest and send them back to prison. Many other factors contributive to their criminalization include homelessness, joblessness, drug and alcohol abuse, sexual and physical abuse by family members, and psychological factors, such as low self-esteem and various forms of alienation, and prisonization (Clemmer, 1958). All these factors together become threads in the snare of functional illiteracy and its ultimate social, economic, and personal dysfunctionality. Further complicating factors, such as ethnic-minority status or learning disabilities of various kinds, only tie the knot tighter that binds together illiteracy and criminality.

2. "NOTHING WORKS"

So severe has been the problem of criminal recidivism that many analysts, in despair of finding a solution, have concluded that "nothing works." Cautioned by Austin MacCormick himself, the father of modern correctional education, we do not want to overestimate the potential of literacy instruction and education in general as a tool of correction.[31] To be sure, a variety of techniques has worked for some offenders: punishment, torture, and fear; religion; work; moralizing; psychological therapy of the *criminal mind*; behavioristic tinkering with the non-soul. None of these, however, has effected an overall reduction in recidivism.

To call the roll of the others who have lamented that *nothing works* is to rehearse a distinguished list of acute observers of prison education. Robert Martinson concluded that "almost nothing works" because rehabilitative programs have no relationship to life outside the prison, and they are incapable of overcoming the prisonization effects of the institution itself; prison industries and vocational education programs teach skills that are obsolete on the *outside*; and rehabilitative efforts do not counteract the criminal's bent to criminality (Martinson, 1974).

Martinson's report rumbled through the corrections community like a thunder clap, and its echoes continue to reverberate. If nothing works, why keep trying? Corrections administrators and officers settle back to do the job society pays them to do, to keep the criminals secure and off the streets. Conscientious, hard-working corrections officials become legitimately cynical about more studies, and they tend to be disbelieving of the researchers' claims. Almost every proposal for a new grant for a new study or a new program is inevitably fueled by the hype and promise of reducing the recidivism rate. A study of grant-proposal rhetoric in the field of prison education revealed that, as realism sets in, the language of promise is lowered from something like "long-term goals of reducing recidivism" to the soberer level of "more immediate concerns, such as service delivery and educational advancement" (Ashcraft, 1979). This type of reality check has led other prison educators to stop talking about recidivism reduction altogether and to start talking about other goals (Enocksson, 1980). The optimistic conviction that increased literacy lowers recidivism (along with the notion that "employment is the ultimate aim of corrections"), D. A. Deppe called a "popular misconception" (Deppe, 1982).

Others similarly have uttered caveats against an overly optimistic regard for the positive effects of education on inmates, especially when that potential is undermined by countervailing negative effects. A leading negative factor is mismanagement of, and bad personal relations within, the prison education programs. Other negative factors include the inmates' low levels of previous education and other achievement (especially work history). Any number of other human factors also have their effects, such as being African-American and poor or Causasian and rich, returning to bad company, drug and alcohol dependence, a non-supportive society, or an unbearable and unwanted sense of responsibility for a family (McCollum, 1977; Knox, 1981; *Locked up but not locked out*, 1982; Wolford, 1982; Linden & Perry, 1982; Coffey, 1982; *D.C. Government*, 1990). Some studies of programs, even programs in which the educational component was strong and the literacy needs of the inmates were addressed, indicate either that recidivism was not reduced or that the statistical results proved insignificant.[32]

3. EDUCATION WORKS

Contrary to the negative reports mentioned above, the emergence of the educational paradigm over the decades of the 1970s and 1980s has given new hope not only for a reduction of recidivism but also for other positive effects on criminal offenders through improving their literacy and engaging them in the *right kind* of education. Although we cannot predict outcomes for individuals (the *mad genius* criminal is of an order of human being different from the majority of the ordinary offenders that we are talking about), we can say that the greater the literacy and the more extensive the education that inmates achieve, the lower will be their recidivism rate; and other benign effects will follow, also.

The studies that report a correlation between greater education and lower recidivism outnumber the studies that report negative conclusions. Indeed, the positive results are so numerous that experts in the field write reports on reports in order to marshal the evidence and ascertain what those programs that are most effective have in common. Moreover, the more sophisticated the reporting becomes, and the larger the basis of data grows, the more positive the results appear to be, rightly understood (*Education and recidivism*, 1991, p. 3).

For example, Marian O'Neil investigated the effect on recidivism of 129 inmates who were released in 1983 after having taken classes in the post-secondary education program of the combined efforts of Draper Prison, Alexander City Junior College, and J. F. Ingram State Technical College in Alabama. The result was that the group who had taken post-secondary education had a recidivism rate of 3.9% as contrasted to a rate of 11.5% for the control group, much lower than the 25% recidivism rate for all those who had been released in 1983 in Alabama. O'Neil's conclusions can stand as a manifesto of the credibility that one can place in post-secondary education's benign influence on the recidivism rate.

Participation of the incarcerated in correctional education programs seems to result in some decrease in recidivism. Prison education also prepares the inmate psychologically for reentry into the free world. Placing the incarcerated into a collegiate atmosphere rather than an intellectually idle atmosphere provides a smoother life both within as well as outside of the walls of the institution. Education is a change-agent; incarceration is meant to change attitudes. The combination of higher education along with incarceration for the qualified inmate can not help but increase the safety of society when the offender is released (O'Neil, 1990, p. 31).

With similar results,. T. A. Ryan summarized research opinion on literacy education and inmate reintegration.[33] Several issues among programs that had supported offenders' post-release employment and held down recidivism, included the following:

- degree of community and interagency involvement
- type of inmate offense
- type of instructional methodology used during prison education
- procedures for course development and implementation
- intake and release procedures employed by the prison
- types of support service (Ryan, 1990; Glaser, 1964; Zink, 1970); Mason & Seidler, 1978; Ingalls, 1973; Mace, 1978; Walsh, 1985; Stevens, 1986)

Based on her analysis of the programs that seemed to her had worked best,[34] Ryan elaborated ten "common characteristics of effective literacy programs for reintegration" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1990). These are cited in full, especially for purposes of comparison with the similar results of Ross and Fabiano (see next):

Characteristics of Effective Literacy Programs for Reintegration

1. The content reflects the diversity of human experience, is meaningful and relevant to the inmates, and addresses real-life concerns and issues such as family, sexuality, children, violence, assertiveness, and substance abuse.
2. The content provides information that inmates need for their return to society, including material on employment, unemployment, housing, transportation, welfare, social security, vocational rehabilitation, education, and health care.
3. The content of programs for young parents with custody of dependent children addresses child care, parenting, nutrition, health and hygiene, and family planning.
4. Courses for inmates with limited English proficiency recognize cultural differences and provide language instruction.
5. The programs integrate basic-skills development with life-skills development.
6. The programs are based on behavioral objectives and are open-entry open-exit, competency-based, and self-paced.
7. The progress and achievements of inmate students are monitored.
8. The learning environment is structured and supportive, providing positive reinforcement and social modeling.
9. Learning experiences and activities provide opportunities for inmate students to apply and practice skills in the context of functional, real-life settings and situations.
10. The programs use individual and group methods, a range of techniques, educational technology, and resources from community groups, business, and industry.

The most sophisticated survey, to date, of studies of the relation between various types of education, literacy instruction, and recidivism is that which appears in the numerous publications of Robert Ross and his colleagues in Canada. Setting their sails in opposition to Martinson's challenge that "almost nothing works" (Martinson, 1974), Ross and Fabiano reminded their readers that Martinson, five years later, had modified his position. They concluded that, although "success is a rare commodity in corrections," where "cognitive corrections" is used, the programs are "highly successful in rehabilitating offenders, yielding reductions of from 30% to 80% in recidivism for follow-up periods as long as fifteen years after program completion" (Ross & Gendreau, 1980, p. 1; Ross & Fabiano, 1983; Ross, 1990).

Ross and Fabiano found that some prison education programs reduced recidivism whereas others seem actually to have increased it. Premising their work on earlier studies, they attempted to discern the difference between "programs that work" and those that do not, "on the basis of the presence or absence of specific cognitive components in the program" (Gendreau & Ross, 1983). Their highly selective criteria for inclusion were that a study had to demonstrate the following characteristics:

- conducted within an experimental or quasi-experimental design
- included follow-up assessment of delinquent or criminal behavior
- yielded a statistical evaluation of outcome data
- was judged for effectiveness on the basis of statistically significant differences between the outcomes of the groups that were enrolled in the prison education programs and control or comparison groups [35]

They found reports of 15 effective cognitive programs,[36] of 10 effective non-cognitive programs (7 of the 10 dealing with juveniles),[37] and of 1 ineffective cognitive program and 24 ineffective non-cognitive programs.[38] Their analysis of the data led them to conclude that "the effectiveness of programs was significantly associated with their use of cognitive training...[and that] how the offender thinks may be associated with his criminal behavior and with his rehabilitation."[39] Keeping in mind these standards for cognitive effectiveness in a prison education program that yields success in reducing recidivism, we have read reports of a number of other efforts that seem to offer further evidence of the success of this approach.[40]

In the bleak world of scholarship about criminals, the news that a certain type of education can be statistically relied upon to reduce recidivism comes as a dazzling revelation. The conclusions of Ross & Co., supported by Ryan, O'Neil, and others, adds up to a new hope for inmate habilitation and an emerging new theory of education in prisons and jails.

F. THE PARADIGMS OF PRISON EDUCATION

Where one stands within the spectrum of opinion as to priorities in the prison depends upon the view of corrections that one holds. This theoretical stance or paradigm directly influences one's understanding and practice of prison education and delivery of literacy. The search for a solution of how best to handle the problems of incarceration has led up many a blind alley.

Most Department of Corrections administrators and officers and many tax payers affirm a penal paradigm: law-and-order, punishment, reformation through "teaching them a lesson," security—the secure containment of offenders in order to protect society—are the uppermost values and the prime reasons for the existence of a prison. Most inmates as well as many corrections reformers oppose this view.

Besides these two diametrically opposed points of view (Eggleston & Gehring, 1986), a broad array of other paradigms is available: the religion or spirituality paradigm,[41] the work paradigm (vocational-educational paradigm),[42] the therapy paradigm,[43] and any number of holistic paradigms (Villavicencio & Gutierez, 1978; *Holistic approaches*, 1982; Hipchen, 1982; Gehring, 1989). The several sub-paradigms tend to emphasize this or that individual aspect of human learning and experience: mathematics (Roundtree, et al., 1982); health and physical sports (*Recreation in corrections*, 1981; Thomas & Thomas, 1988); music, the plastic arts and aesthetics education (*Inside/Out*, 1980); the inter- and intrapersonal dimensions and social interaction (Brasel, 1982; Meussling, 1984; Semmens, 1989); sex education (Farrow & Schroeder, 1984; Gelber, 1988); chemical-dependency education (drugs and alcohol) (Price & Price, 1980); family counseling (Holder, 1978); humanistic therapy (Kendall, 1975); a "human resource development model" (Dobbs, 1984); social education (in a sense different from MacCormick's all-inclusive use of the term); criminal justice (Brodt & Hewitt, 1984); and computers. In some of these sub-paradigms, the greater use of literacy is secondary and subservient to the primary purpose, and literacy is even negated in a few cases (Kendall, 1975; Price & Price, 1980). To the contrary, H. S. Bhola, specialist in international literacy for the United Nations, asserts that literacy itself, and not so much the qualities of a given literacy program nor the intentions of the literacy providers, is what proves liberating in the long run.[44]

Prison educators, whether official D.O.C. staff educators, volunteers from the local literacy effort, or professors from the near-by college, are often caught in the conflict of contending paradigms. Prison educators tend to affirm some version of a cognition paradigm or a moral-, social-, or humanistic education paradigm. While acknowledging the need for security, educators reason that when a prison functions as a school, rather than as a cage or a warehouse or a hospital or an asylum, it will achieve greater success in changing inmates for the better (Wines & Dwights, 1867; Grattan, 1959; Kerle, 1972; Roberts, 1973; Foucault, 1977; Bell, J. H., 1978; Pennsylvania, 1978, Breed, 1981; Angle, 1982; Chaneles, 1985; Callahan, 1987; McClane, 1987; Pendleton, 1988; Maryland Committee, n/d).

1. THE PUNISHMENT PARADIGM

All of the major paradigms, one way or another, remain with us in the prison, each one affecting, for good or ill, the education program. As educators, we agree with Helen Pecht:

> *Corrections is designed for custody and control. Education's purpose is freedom, growth, and self-actualization. The correctional educator must, at the minimum, maintain an island of sanity in a storm of psychosis. At the most, he must work to change the entire system. (Pecht, 1983, p. 87)*

At the first organized, national meeting of reformers in 1870, the experienced acknowledged that improvements in prison education are easier to talk about than to accomplish. The Prison Association of New York reported that the laws supportive of literacy instruction were not being obeyed by the authorities in charge. Although monies had been allocated, they had not been spent on the libraries. Although the laws called for an annual cataloguing of the libraries, none had ever been made. Three years later, the association made another report and, referring to its previous "memorial to the Governor in December, 1870," complained that "since that memorial was laid before the Legislature, about $15,000 more has been appropriated by the State for the same purpose, but no change in the system has been made."[45]

The available funds in New York State went wrong in the 1870s not because of larcenous misappropriation but on account of an unreformed attitude among the prison authorities about convicts. In the minds of the wardens and guards, convicts were criminals to be punished, not students to be coddled by giving them a free education (Roberts, 1971). The near-universal retaliatory, punitive theory of penology remained the dominant corrections paradigm throughout the 19th century and, in many places, continued on through the 20th century. The penal paradigm is, today, in whatever mild forms, the functional paradigm in the minds of many, if not most, D.O.C. personnel.[46] Chief Justice William Howard Taft (U.S. President, 1909-13; Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, 1921-1930) summarized this view:

> *The chief purpose of the prosecution of crime is to punish the criminal and to deter others tempted to do the same from doing it because of the penal consequences....It is a mistake of huge proportion to lead criminals by pampering them, and by relaxing discipline of them and the harshness of prison life, to think that they are wards of the state for their comfort, entertainment, and support. (Quoted in Menninger, 1968, p. 194)*

Complaints about prison administrations and the penal paradigm could be multiplied;[47] they have been a permanent part of the correctional educational landscape (MacCormick, 1931, p. 43; Ohlin, 1977; Bell, et al., 1979). Prison education reports from every available point of view reveal frustration, outrage, and anger (Campbell, 1978; Cioffi, 1980). Prison educators indict their corrections colleagues as high-handed, bureaucratic, authoritarian, totalitarian, and anti-democratic (Goffman, 1961; Traverso, 1975; Foucault, 1977, 1980; Bechtel, 1977; Reynolds, 1982; Kersten & Wolffersdorf-Ehlert, 1982; Jerik, et al., 1987); compulsively control-oriented, inhumane, hostile, and intrusive; undereducated (Schulman & Canak, 1976); underpaid, of low morale (DeBor, 1979; Henderson & Hardison, 1983); and personally unfulfilled (Vicinus & Kinnard, 1980; Willet, 1983; Dierkroger, 1987) penal-minded proponents of "security" who are more interested in smooth-running prisons than they are in (re)habilitated inmates (Prison Educaton Two, 1978; Pinton, 1982; Duguid, 1983; Gehring, 1988; Hamm, 1988b). These "panoptic" (Foucault) technicians of surveillance engage in human control as a surrogate for the punishment and torture of inmates now forbidden by our humane laws (Barnes & Teeters, 1959; Housewright & Fogel, 1977; Jones, 1977; Collins, 1988a, b; Gehring, 1988a).

Some prison officials are advocates of the penal paradigm not only by dint of culture drag and tradition but also due to the new conservatism that has bred a cynicism in many about inmate rehabilitation; moreover, a "new generation" of prison administrators, either MBA-type generalists or political appointees, often without preparation for correctional habilitation, have reduced "offender reformation to an incidental goal of modern-day corrections."[48]

Some prison administrators have a "vested interest in delimiting the size, power, and perhaps even the effectiveness of correctional education programs" because they are willing to "permit the development and expansion of correctional education programs only to the degree that they serve or complement that managerial function. To go beyond that limit...is to threaten the management/security function, and it is unrealistic to expect superintendents to undertake such risks." They are utilitarian in their willingness to allow the proliferation of educational programs in the basic literacies that "make an inmate more 'rational,' and job skills are always useful for the maintenance of the physical plant," but when it comes to post-secondary programs in prisons, "superintendents frequently do an about-face," and manifest a "considerable distaste" for college programs, perceiving higher education as "a haven for ideologies that are flatly contrary to the concept of control. Anti-intellectualism is alive and well among prison superintendents; college programming is frequently seen as contradictory, rather than complementary, to management goals" (Horvath, 1982, p. 9).

A very few vocal D.O.C. personnel boast a male-dominant, macho approach to corrections.[49] Some endeavor to argue a reasoned case for the primacy of security over every other consideration (Saxon, 1991; Herrick, 1991), and in many cases they view educators with considerable disdain as the naive, tweedy, do-gooder, temporary intruders from outside (Jacobs & Kraft, 1978; Johnson, 1978; Braithwaite, 1980; Leone, 1986).

Numerous suggestions have been made to foster cooperation to ameliorate this intolerable situation (Maradian, 1981; Inwald, 1982; National Forum, 1984; Groenevel & Gerrard, 1985; Bento, 1985; Gehring, 1988; Hamm, 1988b; Miller, et al., 1988), the most appealing of which is, perhaps, a paradigm of caring (Seay, 1968; Egan, 1982; Sedlak, 1975; Ross & Fabiano, 1983, pp. 69-70; Toch, 1987; Semmens, 1989). "As such, the rehabilitative ideal demands that caring about inmates be the guiding principle of the corrections process" (Hamm, 1988b, p. 149).

However the breakdown in communication between the two groups of professionals responsible for the education of inmates may be resolved, this human factor is a notable cause of the failure of many literacy and education programs in prisons (Harrison & Wood, 1977), and this human factor appears to be the towering problem-to-be-resolved in prison literacy today (Sebring & Duffee, 1977). Until this conundrum of conflict (Horvath, 1982, pp. 8-14) is solved, no studies, programs, or state-of-the-art reports will meet the needs in America's prisons and jails.

In contrast to the punishment paradigm of corrections, a new and old paradigm of education has been (re)affirmed over the past two decades, and its advocates are now asserting that education can be thought of as the principal change agent in the habilitation of inmates. The education paradigm may be described through five strands of education in prison: moral reasoning, the experience of democracy, a focus on the humanities, an emphasis on the cognitive, and an andragogical approach. These elements are not conceived as separate paradigms, but as a unitive theory of education in prison.

2. THE EDUCATION PARADIGM

Advocacy of the education paradigm is as old as the prison reform movement itself, and it received a great boost forward after the time of Austin MacCormick. In the past two decades, education of inmates has come to be perceived as holding more promise for the (re)habilitation of offenders than any other correctional paradigm.

MacCormick advocated what he called "Social Education": socialization of inmates both through the give and take of daily life and through formal instruction ("direct education" in literacy and other subjects) (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 204-215). Seeing that the majority of inmates was not so much anti-social as "non-social," having been "recruited in large numbers from the undereducated and underprivileged groups in the population," MacCormick reasoned in favor of a moral education "given indirectly" and "in a broad sense" that was not "narrow and pietistic," and he urged wardens to "make a moral life possible and desirable" by teaching inmates occupational skills. To socialize inmates, he proposed "direct education," by which he meant literacy instruction and other forms of adult basic education, libraries, some form of the "honor system," and socialization in community life through the self-government of inmate community organization. Praising Thomas Mott Osborne's experiments in inmate democracy at Sing Sing in 1915, and thereafter at the U.S. Naval Prison at Portsmouth, N.H., where MacCormick had worked under Osborne making "probably the most significant contribution of this generation," MacCormick advocated a society *inside* in which an inmate could live as a participating citizen in a miniature community. Such a community organization would give the prisoner the opportunity to learn by doing under a system where the warden's authority is not relinquished. Supervision, ideally, would be general rather than specific in order to let the community make and corrects its own mistakes. One benefit of an inmate community organization is that it would make the way "more easy for all types of education."

> *Education becomes a community enterprise. Touch is maintained with the real needs and interests of the prisoners because they are able to exercise an influence on the educational program. The educational staff encounters cooperation instead of apathy. Education goes forward because the prisoners themselves are pushing it. Self-improvement is the order of the day; it is good form to take advantage of one's opportunities. The nearest thing to an educational renaissance that the writer has ever seen in a penal institution took place at Sing Sing under Mr. Osborne and Dean Kirchwey in the early days of the Mutual Welfare League. (MacCormick, 1931, p. 215; Osborne, 1916, 1934)*

The notes that MacCormick sounded in 1930 are still, 60 and more years later, characteristic of the best aspects of the correctional educational paradigms of moral, cognitive, and humanistic education:

> *The end result we hope for from all the types of education we offer the prisoner is social education: the socialization of the individual. Our hope is that the man whom we educate to better handling of the fundamental intellectual processes, to greater occupational skill, to better care of his body, to broader understanding of the world he lives in, may not only stop committing antisocial acts but may also fit into the social scheme understandingly and willingly. Much of our present system of criminal justice sets a low aim in that it is willing to have the criminal conform to the social order without understanding of it: the main point is that he conform. It is the aim of education to bring about conformity with understanding. (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 6-7)*

The several elements that we find within MacCormick's *social education* have been elaborated individually by various prison educators, but, surely, the best theoretical and practical paradigm is one that holds the many parts together. The effects of the education paradigms in their many ramifications are exemplified in two outstanding cases in British Columbia. At Matsqui Penitentiary, a 38% lower recidivism rate was reported as the result of a "multi-facetted [sic] program which focussed [sic] on university level courses in the humanities"; and at Grandview, recidivism was reduced from 53% to 6% through training adolescent female offenders in "interpersonal problem-solving and social perspective-taking by teaching them how to assume roles as therapists for their peers" (Ross & McKay, 1979).

3. MORAL EDUCATION

Democratic versions of moral education have been tried with varying degrees of success by structuring individual life within a community in which the checks-and-balances of peer pressure along with a developing sense of individual responsibility evoked the norms of democracy through social interaction (Jacquette, 1982; Ventre, 1982; Duguid, 1981a, 1986a, 1986b, 1987a, 1988; Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1983; Wiley, 1983, 1988; Gehring, 1988a). The thought of Lawrence Kohlberg, who developed his "stages of moral development" partly in response to prison environments, yields the interpretation that, typically, inmates reason morally at "lower" stages than do control groups on the *outside* (Jennings, 1983; Kohlberg, 1969, 1976, 1981). The implication of this seemingly self-evident conclusion would be that educators of inmates need to address the interrupted development of the cognitive process as it relates to the interrupted moral development of perpetrators. When this is done, the studies indicate, the inmates' level of moral reasoning, as defined according to the Kohlbergian scale, advances (Carter, 1986). Like other cognitive acts, the moral act, an act of the will informed by reason, is a question of intellectual skill, a learned ability (Michalek, 1988).

4. DEMOCRATIC SELF-RULE IN THE "JUST COMMUNITY"

A morality paradigm too narrowly conceived can be questioned. What *is* moral education, and whose set of relative moral values and social constructs are we talking about (Fox, 1989)? Morality conceived of democratically in a framework of inmate self-rule in a "just community" of their own devising, however, adequately approximates the larger society in accord with the norms by which inmates upon release shall live. Stephen Duguid, an experienced prison educator with a Kohlbergian perspective who fostered a mini-democracy inside the prisons of

British Columbia, cited the legacy of MacCormick. Osborne, and Maconochie (Osborne, 1916; Tannenbaum, 1933; Semmens, 1989; Kohlberg, 1986), as well as William George's Junior Republic (George, 1911). Duguid argued that experiential impingements of morality, role models, and environmental factors lend realism to the context of moral development:

> *The cognitive stage is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the parallel moral stage, just as the moral reasoning stage is a necessary but not sufficient condition for parallel moral behavior. Thus a crude determinism is avoided but an attempt made to establish causal links between intellectual growth, growth in moral reasoning, and evidence of moral behavior. (Duguid, 1981b, p. 276; see Wright, 1981)*

Citing A. R. Luria (Luria, 1976), Gehring reasoned that the first theme specific to the cognitive-moral process associated with democracy is literacy. Skills basic to literacy—generalization and abstraction, deduction and inference, reasoning and problem-solving, imagination and self-analysis—are also necessary for social habilitation; they accrue when basic academic skills are learned, and they are enhanced when learned in conjunction with social responsibility (Gehring, 1988a, p. 66-67).

5. THE HUMANITIES COMPONENT

John Minahan, in essential agreement with the Kohlbergian approach, added content to morality, arguing that inmates require instruction in the humanities so as to inform them of the traditions, heritage, and norms of the society towards which they are being socialized and within which they are being habilitated. Inmates need to be humanized so that they can be moralized, so that they can *map* the world and their place within it (Minahan, 1990). Humanities instruction, a distinct form of instruction in literacy such as that of Stephen Duguid's "Humanities Core Curriculum" at Simon Frasier University and Matsqui Penitentiary in British Columbia (Ayers, Duguid, Montague, & Wolowidnyk, 1980), proceeds on the theory that "if people learn about their cultural roots, they will be equipped to think their way through some of life's problems" (Eggleston & Gehring, 1986, p. 90). Gehring also cited the thought and work of the Americans Brockway, George, Osborne, Kendall, MacCormick, and Kohlberg; Paolo Freire (Freire, 1970); Malcolm Knowles (see below, "andragogy"); and especially what Gehring called the *Canadian CE paradigm* of Robert Ross and his associates (see below).[50]

6. THE COGNITIVE ELEMENT

Moral reasoning, the exercise of democracy, and inquiry into the humanities are all, whatever else they may be, cognitive processes. The effort to get inmates to *think* about their situation is the characteristic note of the education paradigm as it has been amplified in the past two decades, and employed to unify the correctional education enterprise based on cognitive psychology as opposed to behavioral psychology, and premised on the thought of Piaget, Rey, and Feuerstein (Bertholf, 1974; Cosman, 1980; Ayers, 1981; Eggleston & Gehring, 1986; Alper, 1987; Ross, et al., 1988; Gehring, 1988a, 1989). A cognitive moral approach to correctional education involves the inmate's own effort to identify and correct his or her own criminal-thinking errors, understood as a cause of criminal behavior, according to the seminal suggestions of Samenow and Yochelson (Yochelson & Samenow, 1976; Samenow, 1984).

Thom Gehring summarized the *new* paradigm, especially in view of the failure of other paradigms: "Cognitive or cognitive-moral and democratic methods should be applied to prepare better citizens—[such] that prisons can be transformed into schools" (Gehring, 1988a, p. 63).

> *Correctional Education (CE) past practice has focused on utilitarian, marketable knowledge (vocational educational paradigm) for incarcerated students. The traditional "knowledge, skills, and attitudes" formula—in that priority order—has dominated, although it is clear that incarcerated students would be better served by a reverse order. The behaviorialism which dominates CE (the diagnostic/prescriptive method) and corrections (the medical model) correspond with the old mechanistic world view. CE research is dominated by mechanistically oriented "number crunching methodologies"....The institutions in which we work are managed by coercion and manipulation (penal paradigm), and the role of education is tenuous, at best....Many are working to reshape CE, consistent with the holistic, cooperative global paradigm ("global perspectives, local applications"). (Gehring, 1989, p. 166)*

Both Gehring and Duguid refer to the work of Robert Ross and Elizabeth Fabiano and their colleagues, research-oriented leaders in the Federal Correctional Service of Canada, whose *Time to Think* approach to correctional habilitation includes strong emphasis on a "cognitive component," by which is meant "intervention modalities" that can influence inmates' cognitive functioning, such as "modeling, negotiation-skills training, problem-solving, interpersonal skills training, role-playing, rational-emotive therapy, and cognitive behavior modification" (Ross & Fabiano, 1985, pp. 97-98).

Ross and Fabiano, having exhaustively surveyed existing correctional programs, concluded that "effective programs are truly exceptional," but that "almost every successful program shared one characteristic in common. They included some technique which could be expected to have an impact on the offender's *thinking*" (Ross, 1990, p. 1; Ross & Fabiano, 1985, p. 7; Izzo & Ross, 1989; Fabiano, 1991). The conclusion that "cognition and crime are linked" persuaded Ross and friends to reject earlier non-cognitive paradigms. For four decades they searched for the empirical evidence of *what works* to habilitate offenders. They discovered that "many offenders have never acquired critical reasoning skills."

> *Although [offenders] often are able to rationalize their anti-social behavior[,] the reasoning they use in doing so is frequently simplistic and illogical. Their thinking is often exceptionally shallow and narrow; they construe their world in absolute terms, failing to appreciate the subtleties and complexities of social interactions. Their thinking is concrete, rigid, uncreative and maladaptive. Many fail to consider that their thinking, their behavior, and their attitudes contribute to the problems they experience....[T]hey simply have not acquired an adequate repertoire of reasoning or problem-solving skills which would enable them to respond in alternative ways to interpersonal and economic problems. (Ross, Fabiano & Ross, 1988, p. 45)*

Effective "cognitive corrections," according to Ross and his partners, is characterized by rational self-analysis, self-control training, means-end reasoning, critical thinking, training in interpersonal cognitive problem-solving and social perspective-taking, with an emphasis on process (cognitive skills) as opposed to specific content. Ross and his colleagues affirmed the need for an all-inclusive correctional educational paradigm that would be multi-disciplinary, drawing on the fields of education, child development, cognitive psychology, clinical psychology, psychiatry, and philosophy, with appropriate non-cognitive aspects, as well (Ross & Fabiano, 1983).

In her most recent restatement of their perspective, Fabiano warned against too schoolish an interpretation of their results, as if mere literacy acquisition would be enough to achieve the desired habilitative effects:

> *We learned that the social-interpersonal cognitive skills required for prosocial adaptation can be taught directly and that they differ from impersonal cognitive skills.... We learned...that specific and explicit training in social cognitive skills is required,...that offenders must learn social cognitive skills so they can develop social competence....The challenge for all educators, particularly correctional educators, is for us to move away from the assumption that cognitive skills will develop as a natural consequence of an individual's exposure to various parts of the school curriculum, particularly reading, writing, math, and science. In order to effectively impact on an offender's ability to adjust in a prosocial manner it may be necessary to teach thinking skills in an explicit and direct manner. (Fabiano, 1991, pp. 103-105)*

7. ANDRAGOGY

Duguid took his cue from the words of Thomas Jefferson, a father of democracy and of the University of Virginia, who wanted to empower the whole people: "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them [as is usually the case in most prisons], but to inform their discretion" (Duguid, 1986b, p. 3). To appeal morally-cognitively to adult inmates in at least a somewhat democratic context and in study of their membership in the human community, is to entail the principles of *andragogy* (the learning of adults, as opposed to *pedagogy*, the teaching of children), as elaborated by Malcolm Knowles (Knowles, 1970, 1973, 1975, 1986). Among the methods of andragogy, "contracting" and "peer tutors" are especially effective with inmates (Knowles, 1970, 1973, 1975, 1986). Perhaps more than in any other professional educational guild, prison educators, whose students are *very adult*, have taken Knowles's instruction on adult learning to heart.[51]

An andragogical approach is required when educating adult inmates especially because they can be very frustrating students who often behave like children. Living in an authoritarian environment in which their keepers infantilize them, causing them to manifest the "learned helplessness syndrome," inmates need their teachers to treat them like adults so that they can overcome their behavioral and emotional (as well as educational) retardation and learn that they are adults (Cioffi, 1980; Miller, 1982; *Seminars on Prison Education Series,* 1985; Srivastava, 1986; Kiser, 1987a; Fagan, 1989).

Adult inmates in their capacity as students are described by their andragogues as follows:

- Inmates register powerfully emotional, intensely personal reactions to characters portrayed in literature and historical figures whose lives and actions they feel as affecting, eliciting from inmate students moral critiques about self, others, and life (Burton, 1980; Hedin, 1980; Hruska, 1981; McClane, 1987).
- Inmates are highly motivated, egocentric, concretist in their thinking (*Seminars on Prison Education Series,* 1985); interested in the existential meaning of their studies more than in the abstract or theoretical meaning (Hedin, 1980); so eager to learn that they overcome their personal problems in the attempt.
- Inmates lack the academic social graces. They are willing to interrupt one another and the teacher; have a short attention span; are nervous, withdrawn, defensive, or loud-mouthed; wander in and out of class at will; fail to report promptly to class; talk to one another instead of participating in the group effort; express arch disapproval of one another in class; and engage in power plays and disruptive behavior in the classroom to enhance their sense of freedom and importance (Kiser, 1987a).

Education for its own sake, andragogically delivered to adult inmates and for the purpose of satisfying the innate human curiosity to know, carries us away from *correctional education* conceived as a stick-and-carrot assistant to the penal paradigm, or in the utilitarian service of an ideology of vocational correctionism ("get smart so you can get a job when you get out"), or as a development-by-compulsion mechanism for moral reform, or redefined as a therapy, or merely so that prisoners can read their Bibles (Cosman, 1980; McCarthy, 1985; Collins, 1988b). As one of our informants, an inmate finishing his doctorate, told us, "Don't call it 'correctional education'; don't even call it 'prison education.' Call it 'education in prison'" (see Coffey, 1982).

The overall effect of the education paradigm with its many parts, as summarized by Duguid, is a massive actualization of humane literacy in its many senses:

62

> *Thus whether one opts for student councils and representative democracy, mass meetings on controversial decisions, or informal consultation networks, the involvement of prisoner-students in the educational process and in the administration of the program is essential for the leap to be made from abstract discussion to real choices. Schools do not build character; situations do. To the extent that the school provides situations that involve genuine challenge, it encourages the testing and strengthening of character....This is, in fact, what a humanities education in prison is all about, not just getting criminals jobs, filling time, or providing accreditation, but rather imparting a new vocabulary, a new literacy. And with this new vocabulary, as part of the liberal arts/humanities package, comes cultural literacy, a sense of being part of a polity rather than an outsider, and the option of a new world view, one which enables development to be a lifelong project. (Duguid, 1988, p. 180)*

G. LITERACY PROGRAMS IN PRISONS AND JAILS

1. STATE-OF-THE-ART REPORTS

Beginning with Austin MacCormick and his associates in the 1930s (MacCormick, 1931; Wallack et al., 1939), the correctional educational community has been reporting its empirical and analytical, theoretical and experiential perceptions of the state of literacy in America's prisons and jails on a steady and detailed basis for over 60 years. Sylvia McCollum reported on the situation in the aftermath of the Great Society's effort to reform prison education. Two sets of program statistics from her report show how the situation had improved in the decade following 1966:

Prison-education programs in 1966:

- 27 offered post-secondary correspondence courses
- 17 offered extension courses
- 3 offered televised instruction
- 3 offered study-release programs
- 0 offered the possibility of obtaining a baccalaureate degree

Prison-education programs in 1975:

- 9,000 post-secondary courses completed by federal inmates
- 158 associate degrees awarded
- 19 baccalaureate degrees awarded
- 2 master's degrees awarded
- new styles of delivery of distance-education courses: "university without walls," closed-circuit TV, audiovisual tapes and cassettes
- new styles of study-release programs: "inside/outside" programs, special classes for inmates at nearby schools, halfway-house campus residences (McCollum, 1975).

Ten years later, in 1986, the next thorough report took the form of a directory surveying 400 literacy programs in 225 institutions in 46 states. Volume one of the two-volume summary of education in the federal and state prisons in America is a comprehensive report on literacy education, teaching methods, program goals, student motivation, assessment instruments, and program evaluation; volume two is the directory (Bellorado, et al., 1986, I and II). Bellorado reported that "the quality of the literacy programs described here varies greatly." In some, she could boast of well-trained teachers and tutors for new readers, ABE offerings (though not always for the poorest readers), considerable integration of the literacy programs with vocational and/or life-skills training, some form of assessment, mostly articulated with an explicit and coherent educational philosophy, and reporting "some type of cooperative working relationship with prison administration and security staff." Not so praiseworthy, over half of the programs had nothing for special-education students or non- or limited-English speakers, there was a lack of focus on transition to release and little or no link with outside businesses or the community in about 40% of the programs; staff development was needed throughout, especially in literacy training—at least 40% of the institutions did not report any type of educational staff development program (Bellorado, 1986, II, p. vi).

Two years later, in 1988, a report on the federal system summarized a statistically healthy, expanding situation in ABE programs (see Table 2).

TABLE 2
The Expanding ABE Program in Federal Prisons

YEAR	NEW ENROLLMENTS	COMPLETIONS
1981	2,653	1,441
1982	3,785	1,983 (*)
1983	6,004	3,774
1984	6,896	4,909
1985	8,048	5,221
1986	11,471	5,329 (*)
1987	12,000 (est.)	6,500 (est.)

(*) completion policy: 1982, grade-six; 1986, grade-eight

As of 1988:

- 12,000 inmates (29% of the 44,000 incarcerated adults 18+ years old) were enrolled in ABE programs
- 6,500 inmates completed their programs
- 3,500 inmates were enrolled in GED programs
- 2,800 inmates received diplomas

All inmates must take the ABLE (Adult Basic Level Examination) upon entering prison. Anyone who scores below 8.0 grade level on any subtest must enter ABE for 90 days, two hours per day (Littlefield & West, 1990, p. 10; Muth, 1988).

The 1990 directory of post-secondary programs is the most recent broad indicator that we have of the overall, as uneven as ever, condition of educational programs at that level in federal prisons. Eleven of the 64 institutions reporting had no programs at all; in other institutions, as many as three separate colleges or universities were delivering education to the inmates. The directory contains information on the schools, kinds of degrees they offered, major areas of study, non-degree courses, and whether inmate-students might attend courses on campus or only within the prison (Directory of Postsecondary Education Programs, 1990).

Since the Great Society re-jump-started prison education reform in the 1960s, many other reports of various kinds on literacy programs have been made, including histories of correctional education and surveys of the professional literature;[52] status reports;[53] bibliographies;[54] surveys made by telephone or with a questionnaire;[55] analytical scrutiny of selected issues;[56] descriptions of model programs;[57] close looks at given situations accompanied by the investigators' theories and suggestions for policy improvement;[58] proceedings of significant conferences;[59] assorted catalogues, overviews, directories;[60] and policy manuals and resource and reference guides.[61]

2. LOCAL JAILS

Local jails in towns, cities, and counties across the nation are the dark continent of unexplored territory in prison education. No adequate and up-to-date study exists that tells us about them. As recently as 15 years ago in the year of America's bicentennial celebration, Michael Reagen and Donald Stoughton had almost nothing positive to report. The jails were almost totally lacking in academic or vocational educational programs, and those that existed were unaccredited and informal; most did not have libraries, though inmates were permitted to receive outside publications; most were lacking in physical facilities in which educational programs might be conducted; vocational training and contract programs were nonexistent; no classification processes, no tracking of inmate evaluation, no assessment of either student or program performance existed that yielded any meaningful data on achievement levels or needs of inmates; in the handful of exceptional situations, "the programs were viewed with amused indifference by most of the prison staff and the inmates were considered troublesome curiosities" (Reagen & Stoughton, 1976, pp. 63, 67-68). Two years later in 1978, 74% of jails offered neither education nor vocational training (Lewis & Shanks, 1978). By 1982, that rate had improved by an estimated one percentage point (Coffey, 1982).

Only about 7% of the incarcerated population is held in jails. The challenge of education in jails is to do something useful in the brief periods of time during short sentences and pre-conviction stays of jail inmates, typically shorter than the time served in state and federal institutions. Fifty-two percent of jail inmates are either on trial, or awaiting arraignment or trial (Kline, 1990). Study to take the GED takes longer than many inmates have time in jail, so efforts have been made to devise effective short-term programs that might take as little as two hours to complete (American Correctional Association, 1979; Walakafra-Wills, 1983).

Local jails, however, also house state prisoners for longer terms who cannot be accommodated in state facilities because of the overcrowded conditions—as many as 26% of state inmates in Tennessee, for example, were held in equally overcrowded, local jails in 1989 (Greenfield, 1990; Kline, 1990). In jails where no educational programs are offered, the inmates have little opportunity to occupy their minds in habilitative study.

In 1992, the situation, we believe, is somewhat better in some places, thanks in part to the heightened interest in adult literacy brought about by the *Literacy Decade* of the 1980s, the work of the National Coalition for Adult Literacy, including the Correctional Education Association, and the efforts of hundreds and thousands of local heroes and saints—unpaid volunteers from Laubach and LVA, business people, lawyers, school teachers, and church folk (Bosma, 1987). In other places, however, the situation has not changed at all. Education for inmates in many local jails is a wasteland and a desert, a nonentity, a null, a human void.

Reports on literacy programs in jails include the highly specific programs and resources manual of the American Correctional

Association (ACA, 1979), a handbook for establishing adult education programs in county jails, accompanied by a description of the model program in the Bell County Jail in Texas (Johnson & Baca, 1985), another report on a Texas jail in the County of Bexar (Diem & Knoll, 1981, 1982), and a description of a number of model jail programs as of 1989 (Diem & Knoll, 1981, 1982), and some others (see Jacobs & Adams, 1971; *Jail Inmate Rehabilitation*, 1972; Stayer, 1975; Wimer, 1985; Kurtz, et al., n/d). The Michigan County Jail Inmate Rehabilitation Program was exemplary not only for its educational offerings but also on account of its post-release follow-up, medical and drug treatment in a cooperative program involving the jail, social agencies and community participation. Citizens for Modernized Corrections worked in their community to initiate the education programs (GED courses, tailoring, vocational skills, and yoga), counseling, recreation, and referrals to social services (Kurtz, et al., 1977).

As local communities have become aware of the habilitative effects of education on inmates, enlightened self-interest and humane concern have prompted action. Educational programs can reduce the problems associated with overcrowded conditions such as boredom, stress and pain levels, violence, and generally bad living conditions.[62]

As in prison, so in jails, the human factor, including local politics, plays the controlling role that makes education possible or not. For the most part, programs in jails are administered by elected sheriffs who are rarely corrections professionals, and even less often educators. The sheer turnover in administrators makes program continuity and development difficult, if not impossible (Horan, et al., 1975). On the other hand, jailers skeptical of education efforts, have legitimate complaints. Funding that begins with grants for innovation is often curtailed or ended, and the local government must pay the freight. Materials for the classes often do not match the life experiences of the inmates; hence they become upset and troublesome. Technological aids installed need trained personnel to make them run, but funds to hire or train are usually in short supply, and non-functional machines are worse than no machines at all. The following letter which we received from a program coordinator for a county literacy coalition summarizes the situation well:

> *The [literacy] program at our local jail is on hold for several reasons. First of all, the sheriff we were working with was voted out in the May election and the new sheriff does not want to get involved at this time. Second, the present jail lacks adequate, secure space. However, a*

new jail is under construction that will have educational classroom space, so we hope the sheriff will approach us next year when it will appear to be HIS idea! [Anonymous]

H. IMPLICATIONS FOR A MODEL LITERACY PROGRAM IN PRISONS AND JAILS

Our entire report is, in a sense, a discussion of model programs, for we are more interested to report on *what works* than on what has failed. Through our discussions of paradigms and recidivism (above), and by drawing on numerous reports about hundreds of programs, we have in effect elicited a profile of a *model program*. Could a single program but enjoy the perfection of having all its possible parts! In recommending this or that aspect of a model program, we hesitate to imply our approval for an entire program and its outcomes with which we ourselves are not directly acquainted. In this section, therefore, rather than offering a redundant list of model programs, we propose a roster of elements which, from a literacy instructor's perspective, would theoretically form part of a model program.

What works? is a question to be asked not only in terms of reducing recidivism but also in terms of achieving a much broader range of educational goals, and the answer, to our way of thinking, belongs to a concern for human well-being, whether the person to be educated is a short-term transient in a jail, a lifer in the pen, or an inmate about to graduate from the "school of habilitation." A model program of literacy instruction, therefore, in addition to decreasing the recidivism rate, does the following:

- educates broadly
- is governed for the sake of the learners
- makes prison life more livable
- is cost-effective
- improves the quality of life
- provides a new reader's library
- makes appropriate use of educational technology
- is the right thing to do

1. A LITERACY PROGRAM EDUCATES BROADLY

A model educational program in prison is all-inclusive (Holder, 1978; Moore & Miller, 1979; Beto, 1990), supplying inmates with cognitive, literacy, social, and job skills that they will need when they are released. Even if one holds to the most stringent penal paradigm of prison reform, it makes no civic sense to withhold from inmates the information and training that they shall need upon release, lest they pass from being wards of the state as inmates to become wards of the state on welfare.

M. C. Hambrick defined the "ideal correctional education system" as including the following: small size, appropriate phases (orientation/assessment; academic and skills development, including social interaction and supportive use of leisure time and health awareness; release readiness and reintegration with family and community services), computer aids, fair and consistent discipline, and—an element which we heartily second—an overall climate characterized by activity, excitement, and caring (Ryan, 1977).

A model program in literacy is a program in *literacies*:

- **social literacies:** cultural literacy (including in some instances bilinguality both in one's native tongue and in English as a second language (Lafayette, 1987), gender literacies, civil literacy (one's legal and political rights and responsibilities, coping with IRS forms, taking a driver's-license test, getting a social security card), consumer literacy and maintaining a checking account at a bank, and social-welfare literacy. (Upon release, will a former inmate be literate enough to seek out the social-welfare agencies that will give help in coping with any remaining deficiencies in the other literacies, and can one read and write well enough to cope with the forms to be filled out?)
- **occupational literacies:** job skills (including the abilities to read technical instructions and memos, use multiple texts to complete tasks and solve problems, "read" the situation in terms of the professionalism required and other job demands, and get along with one's fellow workers and with the boss), self-image and assertiveness, interviewing savvy, and employability.
- **body literacies:** health and disease and nutritional literacies (Can one make sense of the polysyllabics on a box of prepared food so as to comprehend the roster of potentially harmful chemicals one is ingesting?); substance-abuse literacy; sexual literacy, including sexually transmitted diseases, especially AIDS;

procreative literacy (Does a woman understand her body's workings well enough and the means available to help her so that she can avoid conceiving unwanted offspring?); parenting and family literacies.

To facilitate inmate education in many of these matters, the American Correctional Association has prepared manuals for inmates (ACA, 1979). Education in economic literacy includes consumer education. The evidence of studies is that many inmates are quite lacking in consumer awareness, and besides, an inmate who has been in prison for a number of years may consequently have lost contact with our consumer economy (*Planning Consumer Education*, 1978; Brooks, 1980). Many kinds of literacy instruction can support success in life and on the job: a Dutch educational program for short-term inmates incarcerated for drunk driving improved the participants' knowledge, attitudes, and subsequent driving habits (Bovens, 1987). Greater literacy was essential during the education phase that preceded the therapy phase of a drug addiction program in the San Diego County jail (Ariessohn & Lott, 1990). The state prison system in New Hampshire published a handbook that reads like a college catalogue for student-inmates describing the various programs offered in the prison school: tutoring, basic literacy instruction, basic-skills programs, GED, high-school diploma courses, career orientation courses, and college-credit courses, with all the usual application procedures, the attendance policy, course offerings, library rules and regulations, and advice on how to use the interlibrary loan facility and the reference service (New Hampshire State Prison, 1978). The SEED Curriculum (Social, Emotional, Educational Development) seems to be a program exemplary for its all-inclusiveness (Montgomery & Rosamond, 1987).

2. A LITERACY PROGRAM IS GOVERNED FOR THE SAKE OF THE LEARNERS

A model education program in prison is set up and administered primarily to serve the needs of the learners in the most efficient ways possible, and secondarily to meet the security and other requirements of the institution; a model education program, even in prison, is educative, first, and correctional, if possible, second.

Literacy programs in prisons are governed in a variety of ways: as correctional-educational functions within the D.O.C., as part of a prison chaplaincy, as the volunteer effort of an external literacy organization or school, as an organized and semi-autonomous academic operation supplied to the institution on a cooperative basis by an external college or university, as an aspect of vocational education within a workplace-literacy arrangement with a private corporation, as the work of an autonomous *Prison School District* for the state or locality.

A hot topic in correctional governance these days is "privatization," which has at least three nuances of meaning. Primarily it refers to the building and managing of prisons by private corporations for profit. Similarly, it can also refer to the control and operation of prison industries—together with associated career education and workplace literacy efforts—under the supervision of businesses from the private sector, with the intention of turning prison industries into commercially profitable enterprises and appropriate workshops for vocational education, rather than uninspiring make-work schemes. Under both of these definitions, privatization is beyond the purview of this report. Defined as reorganizing the educational dimension of the prison system under the supervision of educators, rather than of correctionists, the privatization of education in prison is a sense of the word well within the scope of our interests and a promising approach to making prison education vital and effective (Potuto, 1980; Conrad & Cavros, 1981; Kersting, 1983; Ewing, 1985; New Partnerships, 1985; Burger, 1985, 1986).

Most vocational education in prisons has been indicted for its irrelevance to the workplace and marketplace of the real world. Though no causal connection can be established between vocational education in prison and inmates' future job success, it nonetheless stands to reason that when inmates develop job savvy and technical competence within the framework of larger educational and personal achievements, and the skills necessary to cope with life, their improved on-the-job and in-society attitudes will contribute to their subsequent positive behavior and success in the community (Whiteson, C. M., 1977). To be an acceptable facet of literacy education, vocational education needs to be more than old-style training in job skills. For many, a *job* on the outside for which one needs merely *skills* would be an unacceptable style of employment and no step higher on the career ladder; therefore, broadly based and widely ranging "career education" must of necessity become an increasing part of vocational education in prisons, and that means full attention to many styles of personal and professional literacies (Texas Dept. of Corrections, 1979; Flanagan, 1982; Izzo & Drier, 1987).

Tying two definitions of privatization together in an emerging alternative to vocational education, "Correctional TIE" (Training, Industries, and Education) is one of the newest ideas for making vocational and career education in prisons more relevant and keeping it up-to-speed with the marketplace and workshop of the real world "outside." Moreover, because the expanding effort for workplace literacy instruction has become fashionable in the world of private businesses and industries, the TIE connection seems natural: tie prison literacy together with vocational education by way of developing real-world workplace literacy (McGlone & Mayer, 1987; *Correctional Training, Industries & Educaton*, 1990). Whether the TIE concept is another idea for prison reform that, in the long run, will prove ineffective, remains to be seen. We agree with Osa Coffee that the "reading to do" emphasis of workplace literacy makes sense in prison, and with Neal Miller, "that TIE makes good sense; shouldn't we try it?" (Littlefield & West, 1990, pp. 24-26, 22).

Privatization of prison education, in the sense of establishing a "prison school district" under the supervision of a board of educators, is an idea whose time came some time ago, raising with it great expectations for overcoming the perennial problems of prison education. In 1969, Texas and Connecticut were the first to establish correctional school districts, and as many as twelve states have experimented with the concept, most of them successfully (although control of prison education in Alaska and New Jersey, on account of political squabbles and funding problems, has reverted to the Department of Correction). Virginia's correctional school district is the most independent within the Department of Correction. Independent control of prison education is opposed by many prison administrators and legislators because they see the school board as having too much autonomy. They view education as a low-priority item diverting too much of their resources, and the public's fear of crime has put the electorate into a punitive frame of mind.

Notwithstanding this opposition, one of the most successful correctional school districts, the Windham School District in Texas, has demonstrated the viability of the concept and boasts of funding for education having multiplied 10 times in 6 years (due mostly to the agency's entitlement to state and federal pass-through money on a basis equal with other education agencies). Windham increased in staff from 8 uncertified members to 172 fully certified members in the same period of time, increased in student participation by 40%, increased in the quality of the education program and full accreditation of the Windham School District by the Texas Education Agency and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. A lowered recidivism rate is also claimed.[63]

Another reason to remove education for the adjudicated population from the direct control of the D.O.C. is because the D.O.C. is not primarily interested in the fate of the inmate after the inmate is released, whereas educators share a positive and larger concern with the entire judicial system and with society at large in facilitating the success of the post-release inmate graduate. Three times as many adjudicated people are under the supervision of the courts as also are the one million-plus inmates now housed behind bars, but concentrated efforts to improve the literacy of parolees, probationers, and others, and of released, former inmates, are far fewer and less-well-developed than are in-house prison literacy programs. New energy and funds must be found to help through education those who are *outside* to stay *outside* (Riggs & True, 1981; Burstow, 1989; Wimer, 1985, 1983). Education in many instances needs to be extended to the ex-inmate's family, as well. (Hairston & Lockett, 1987).

Study-release and other options for education outside of prison are not used at all in most places, or are used only at token levels, because prison officials and politicians are afraid of backlash in public opinion when the occasional released offender does serious harm. Nevertheless, study-release and study-furlough, when combined with contracting with inmate-students for educational achievement in conjunction with a fixed release date, has been demonstrated to increase the inmate's level of performance (Phillips, 1974). The politicians and the public must decide whether varieties of educational release are worth the risk, or that we are going to let the *bad seed* ruin the opportunities for those who could make good use of them.[64] One of the greatest problems in prisons is the public's attitudes towards prisons.

"Project PROVE" (Parolees and Probationers Realize Opportunities via Education) is one successful and improving effort in the direction of life-long learning for former inmates (Potts & Tichenor, 1989). The state of Florida has offered a select group of defendants the opportunity to escape prosecution by completing a high-school equivalency course, including being mentored by civic and business people, taking college courses in job-search skills, and improving basic literacy (Austin, 1988).

3. A LITERACY PROGRAM MAKES PRISON LIFE MORE LIVABLE

A model educational program in prison makes life behind bars more tolerable for inmates (and indirectly more tolerable for their keepers). Education in prison for many inmates has a benign and socializing effect on their personalities, resulting in a more humane atmosphere within the prison itself. Most prison authorities realize that literate inmates are easier to govern because they can understand the many written forms one cannot escape even by going to prison—orientation interview forms, classification waiver forms, medical screening forms, inside movement passes, money and property-transfer request forms, child visit authorizations, voluntary interview statements, store chits, staff *action* request forms, and others (Pinton, n/d). More-literate inmates are thus more capable of reading, understanding, and complying knowledgeably with prison regulations, and communicating with prison authorities about the information needed to keep the institution running smoothly. Prisons and jails that respond to inmates' need for information become saner places for all concerned, morale is higher, and inmates and staff have the possibility of informed and rational cooperation (Curry, 1974; Vogel, 1976). The ability to relax and enjoy a good book reduces the stress level, increases tolerance for over-crowded conditions, causes the inmates to require less supervision, even cures headaches, and leads to less violence and less destructive behavior.

From the point of view of the warden in the office and the officer in the hall interested in security, all this means lower repair and operating costs for the prison, lessened tension for the line officers, and, eventually, that the well-run prison works as a public-relations tool for prison administrators. Better-educated inmates are more tractable. They break the rules less often—a high recommendation indeed for greater literacy and for prison education in general (Alston, 1981; Lawrence, 1985; Gleason, 1986; Wolford, 1986; *Literacy: A Concept for All Seasons,* 1989). According to Ernesta Pendleton, program analyst for the Lorton Prison College Program, "Education promotes civility, develops cognition, and encourages confidence. These three Cs should guide the thinking of our approach to criminal...habilitation" (Pendleton, 1988, p. 84, citing Breed, 1981).

Moreover, inmates whose literacy is improving, gain self-respect because they are improving themselves, and they gain the respect of others as well (Gleason, 1986). This civilizing effect of literacy makes a style of participatory democracy possible when the literate community works together to solve common problems and plan educational programs satisfactory to themselves, especially including sensitivity to otherwise divisive multicultural issues (Semmens, 1989).

The amount of academic accomplishment among inmates is positively related to self-esteem and social competence (though not to self-efficacy, i.e., adaptive behavior in a problematic situation) (Parker, 1990). Reading achievement and reading program variability is positively correlated with self-concept and the acceptance of others among prison inmates (***Reading and Study Skills,*** 1984). African-American inmates, especially, significantly increased their self-esteem as they increased their math competency (Roundtree, 1979). All this educated increase of self-esteem, and the like, adds up to a number of desirable effects in a prison population: as the measure of educational attainment increases, the need for social distance decreases, a factor with positive implications for race relations in prisons (Pass, 1988). As the amount of leisure time spent studying increases, the number of disciplinary problems in the prison decreases.[65]

The *Just Community* project at the Connecticut State Farm for Women in Niantic was an exemplary model of the civilizing effect of literacy for democracy in prison. The participants followed the example of the ***mutual welfare league*** experiment in controlled democracy conducted in Auburn and Sing Sing by Thomas Mott Osborne and Austin MacCormick and others from 1913 to 1916. The inmates' own democratic society within the prison included an inmate court staffed by inmate judges to rule upon inmates' crimes against one another within their democracy. Trained interviewers came to the conclusion that the effects observed on the women who took part in the experiment (75%) far exceeded those observed in a control group (33%) in the acceptance of democratic processes, political structures, and disciplinary decisions, and in relaton to their improved ability to make moral decisions (Scharf, 1981; see Duguid, 1987a; Michaelek, 1988).

Part of a humanized and democratic approach to education is one-to-one tutoring and peer instruction, both strategies being especially effective with adult learners. One-to-one tutoring is a learner-centered instructional method and an intimate form of discourse during which the capable tutor can respond directly and immediately to the questions, correct the miscues, and approve the triumphs of the adult learner. It is also a form of society in which student/teacher bonding can take place most easily, a style of interaction essential in prison education. The amount of training and ongoing support that tutors receive is critical to the quality of the service they provide (Dinges, 1975).

The Linkers, a club of student ex-inmates, seems to have been a model body of organized peer teachers who formed a support system for inmate day-students at John Jay College in Illinois, thus serving the double purpose of helping fellow students who were still inmates and helping themselves by being helpful and staying in touch with the educational program through which they had habilitated themselves (McVey, 1977). Peer tutors were found to be a part of the answer in a research and demonstration program in Maryland (Hagerstown, 1982), Missouri (*310 Project*, 1984) and in Louisiana (Lafayette, 1987). A reading strategy that combines well with peer-tutoring is the neurological impress method (NIM), a method that has demonstrated its effectiveness in prison settings (Traynelis-Yurk & Yurek, 1990).

The human habit of being helpful to one another becomes a set of specific tasks within an inmate community in which peers are allowed to perform for one another various kinds of services that others may provide less well. Because inmates, many of them socially disabled people themselves, are typically targets for the complex of *human services* and *social services*, the so-inclined inmate may be an equally likely candidate to become a purveyor of these services inside the prison—counseling and social work of many kinds (psychological, family, sexual, addictions),[66] paralegal assistance (Conner, et al., 1978; O'Brien & Arbetman, 1978), corrections (Tacardon, 1983), and peer education of many kinds (from basic literacy to higher education).

Following an uprising in North Carolina's Central Prison, for example, the instigators who had thus already demonstrated their leadership qualities were isolated as *incorrigibles,* but then they enrolled in a resocialization program in which they were educated to become corrections counselors to work with juvenile delinquents who themselves had been labeled *incorrigibles.* Fifteen men in two groups were trained academically and practically in counseling skills and then assigned their case load of young incorrigibles. The paraprofessional corrections counselors were observed and tape-recorded at work, and they were assessed in terms of their empathy, respect, and genuineness. The project was successful, and one conclusion was that inmates make good counselors for other inmates (Wheeler & Jones, 1977).

We are acquainted with an inmate at Indiana Women's Prison who has decided to become a psychological counselor. In Martin University classes, she has undertaken voracious reading assignments to become acquainted with the history of psychoanalysis, alternative methods of psychological help in traditional cultures, connections among women, women's incarceration for crime and institutionalization for madness, and other relevant topics. This student knows that she will be *inside* for a long time; she plans to become IWP's best counselor of younger women, whether officially or unofficially.

4. A LITERACY PROGRAM IS COST-EFFECTIVE

A model educational program in prison pays for itself in a variety of ways. The cost-effectiveness of the education of juveniles in custody is perhaps easier to grasp because its results are both more immediate and more evident. The results of *Project Intercept* in Denver were a clear and unmistakable success. Diversion of first- and second-offenders under age 14 into programs of educational and psychological habilitation and success-oriented family and school intervention, led to 53% to 58% fewer re-arrests than was the case with a control group, and, moreover, led as well to significant improvements in school attendance and performance (*Project Intercept*, 1974). The results of a similar program in Denver, *Project New Pride*, can be talked about in terms of dollars and cents. A community-based program of education, individual counseling, vocational skills training, cultural enrichment, and construction of higher esteem for the delinquents and for others, requiring a high staff-to-client ratio, and involving the efforts of 18 professionals, numerous volunteers, a psychologist, a sociologist, and an optometrist, resulted, nonetheless, in a somewhat lower recidivism rate of 27%, compared to a 32% control group during the first year. After one year, the recidivism rate for the 161 who completed the program was only 11%. Moreover, 70% of the "New Pride" participants became successfully employed, and 40% went back to school. Because it cost approximately $12,000 per year at that time to incarcerate a youth in Colorado, whereas *New Pride* spent approximately $4,000 per year per juvenile client, the immediate savings to the citizens of Colorado was slightly over $1.1 million. The future savings to the State of Colorado are incalculable in terms of the 89% who did not recidivate, and the earning power of those people who went on to be better educated, responsible citizens instead of functionally illiterate criminals is even greater (Blew, et al., 1977).

Other programs have similarly been studied from the perspective of their cost-effectiveness, with the same positive results.[67] It has been said for many years that "four years in prison costs more than a Harvard education," and as expensive as going to school at Harvard has become, going to prison has more than kept pace. Working on the principle that education is more cost-effective than is incarceration, the Indiana Correction Advisory Committee calculated that educating inmates would initially save the state $7 million per year.[68] Were one to calculate the other savings—lower recidivism, improved morale of corrections officers, increased productivity of habilitated inmates upon their release—the savings would be many times greater.

Because education in prison is cost-effective, a tax dollar spent on prison literacy, rather than being an economic infringement on the hard-working, law-abiding public, is an investment in law and order, a savings over and above the high cost of crime. In 1982, slightly over 22,000 inmates in state institutions were also college students, and the tax-supported Pell Grant was the indirect means of paying for about 35% of their education. Awards for that academic year ranged from $120 to $1,670, for up to half the cost of one's education—a fraction of the amount it takes to house an inmate (the costs of incarceration range anywhere from $15,000 to $80,000 per year, depending on a number of variables). Ten years later, however, Senator Jesse Helms (Rep., North Carolina)—acting consistently with the economic policies of the New Federalism—was attempting to cut off these grants that some believe reduce recidivism, result in other positive effects for prison inmates, and ultimately save the tax-payer the price of more people in prison (Williford, 1991; see O'Hayre & Coffee, 1982). At $2,500 total per year, the people of Senator Helms's state spend the least in the nation to defray the costs of their state-mandated literacy program for adult inmates, whereas the people of Texas spend the most, $23 million (Hills & Karcz, 1990).

Prison industry, done right, becomes a feature of the educational program, for workplace literacy is at the heart of the adult learner's literacy needs. Prison industry not only can be cost-effective such that it pays for itself, but it can also turn a profit. Project PRIDE (Prison Rehabilitative Industries and Diversified Enterprises), a non-profit but profitable program in Florida to reduce inmate idleness, lower corrections costs, and involve inmates in meaningful work and rehabilitation opportunities, increased inmate employment by 70%, eliminated profitless enterprises, and turned over a profit of $4,052,508 in 1987, almost double the Florida correctional industry's profits for the previous 20 years. Even so, it was estimated that PRIDE was employing only half of the available workforce.[69]

A well-educated, better-skilled prison workforce, trained in problem-solving and productivity, cost-effectively managed by an enlightened prison administration teamed with a self-administering prison workforce, all in the context of ever-expanding literacies, could not only pay its own way but also could turn a profit and buy its own educational services and other amenities. A properly educated prison workforce could replace idleness and boredom with productivity, decrease tax-payers' corrections costs, increase offenders' restitution payments, and simultaneously develop inmates' real-world job skills, all of which adds up to the personal bottom line of satisfaction over a job-well-done and the attending self-esteem that so many inmates so dreadfully lack (Stewart, 1985).

5. A LITERACY PROGRAM IMPROVES THE QUALITY OF LIFE

A model prison educational program helps inmates use time on their hands constructively; builds their self-confidence; improves their morale (Curry, 1974); makes them optimistic about their future; allows them to learn new things that their natural curiosity makes them want to know about—the humanities, the sciences, math, other languages, how to fix a car; gains for them a sense of personal respect, dignity, socialization, and well-being; teaches them self-control, tolerance, and to take responsibility; and makes them happy (*Educational Needs*, 1973; Jacobs & Dana, 1975). Education humanizes by allowing inmates to do civil things that people like to do—read books and write letters to friends or family members. Literacy education also empowers the powerless: literate inmates can write letters to lawyers and judges (*Educational Needs*, 1973; Jacobs & Dana, 1975), understand the law, study their own legal cases, research the relevant jurisprudence in the massive tomes that line the walls of every prison library, and thereby help themselves secure their own rights before the law and help themselves to justice.[70]

Education for humanity allows inmates to overcome their incorrect self-perceptions, whether they think too little of themselves (as many typically do) or suffer from over-inflated imaginations about themselves (as many others typically do) (Sedlak, 1975; Roundtree, et al., 1982; Smith, 1987; Pendleton, 1988; Dufour, 1989; Parket, 1990). Many inmates have a higher and sometimes more unrealistic estimation of their intrinsic personal value than do the prison authorities. An outmoded vocational education course in a prison auto-mechanics shop, or unrewarding labor in some low-paying, tedious prison industry using inadequate tools towards the accomplishment of some purpose that the worker him- or herself does not approve, is hardly habilitative of a person who imagines her- or himself as an accomplished professional.[71] In any event, prison education, because it is education of adult human beings who are far more aware of their individuality than are school children, needs to be highly individualized education. A model educational program in prison is devised through interactive, andragogical discourse that focuses upon interests, needs, desires, frames of mind, and preferred learning styles of the adult learners so as to achieve its maximal effect in terms of the predictability or likelihood of the individual inmate's being able to take advantage of a given educational program (Tam & Rogers, 1978; Orsagh & Marsden, 1984; Collins, 1988a, 1989).

In Idaho, prison authorities abandoned a cookie-cutter approach to education and took their inmates' negative individual characteristics into consideration: unrealistic self-esteem, unconventional value systems, self-destructive behaviors, ineffective coping mechanisms, reluctance to take appropriate risks, and unwillingness to assume responsibility for their own actions. When a curriculum was designed specifically to address the details of these particular socially disabling qualities, the recidivism rate of the 289 participants dropped to a remarkably low 8.3% (Lee, 1988). Inmates at Matsqui in British Columbia who took part in a filmed theatrical production at the prison spoke of the sense of liberty that they enjoyed in the re-creative effort. They became engrossed in the production such that it took them *outside*—outside of the prison routine, outside the repressions of the institution, and outside their own criminal histories (*Inside/Out,* 1980).

Because education of inmates is the education of adults, literacy instruction *must* be andragogical, *must* be more than pedagogical skills training, *must* be adult-oriented education aimed at the needs, receptivity, and craving for meaning that these adult individuals manifest. Inmates in literature classes tend to react directly existentially, rather than critically theoretically, to the literature being read, and they sometimes identify with characters and themes that "nice people" find reprehensible. Inmates, for example, identified with the anti-hero in a short story, a successful, slick, and glamorous racketeer (Burton, 1980; Hruska, 1981). Education of adults in prison is not merely keeping school; it is grappling with the issues of life, and this affects the instructional method.

Students of reading and literacy speak of a *bottom-up* approach and a *top-down* approach. If emphasis is laid on *breaking the code* and adding it up—as one adds up phonetic sounds to sum a word, linguistic components to describe a verbal pattern, and patterns of words to arrive at meaning—then the bottom-up approach (in the style of the traditional Laubach and IBM PALS programs) is being taken. If emphasis is laid on "language experience" and meaning as derived from reading enjoyable and instructive literature and using complete sentences, and conceptual contexts—as one expresses ideas through the literary discourse of dictating a story and then reading it back, editing and rewriting, until one is satisfied with the product—then the top-down approach (in the style of the Literacy Volunteers of America and Whole Language methods) is being taken (Oakley, 1988).

We assert that a bottom-up approach, to whatever extent it is premised on the mistaken belief that emergently literate adults and new readers of basic texts cannot handle anything more sophisticated, is inadequate to meet all the needs of an adult learner. Similarly, the assessment process needs to be as adult and individualized as the instruction process. A suppositional definition of adult functional competency based on the generic results of a national survey is not individualized enough (see Shelton, 1985).

Instructional methods, educational goals, and assessment instruments go hand-in-hand. The program ought to be taught with means that lead towards desired ends, and then results assessed with measures that both grow out of and were planned in advance in terms of, the previously agreed-on goals. Just as workbook pages neatly filled in and make-work assignments perfectly filled out are not authentic literary artifacts, neither are they the kinds of literary output that adults most desire to produce. Letters of many kinds—business, love, to one's family, to the editor—are *authentic*, as are a correctly completed job application, an autobiography, a story, and a poem. Assessment of learners' progress needs to be in terms of these *high-interest* products. A newly literate adult may be entirely able to pass a so-called *competency* test but still be hopelessly incompetent to cope with real-world situations that call for real-life literacy skills.

Education of all kinds, literacy included, does best when it arises directly from the learner's stated interests and desires. The PACE program in Chicago seems to have taken an integrated approach (*Reading Program Profiles*, n/d). Thomas A. Edison College in New Jersey was ahead of its time in the individualization of assessment (Thomas A. Edison College, 1976). The Martin University program at Indiana Women's Prison is expressly andragogical, as was the program at Menard Correctional Center in Illinois: totally individualized, multi-modal, adapted to the needs of the adult learners (Helgeson & Hisama, 1982; Wallace, 1992).

A further aspect of andragogy is the style of reward offered. Everyone works to gain rewards, inmates no less so. School children study to earn gold stars, and inmate-students will study better and smarter, achieving long-term goals, if short-term rewards are andragogically appropriate. In a model literacy program, valuable and desirable incentives are offered to stimulate achievement and success. Incentives include higher pay for prison work on completion of GED, shortening the prison time of participants, more free time for study, presence of female instructors in all-male facilities, emphasizing promotion to the next higher educational level while in prison, and making the library richer and more accessible (Hard, 1976). As with many of us, money may well be the best incentive of all; inmates should be paid to perform well in their studies, just as students *outside* get grants and fellowships. Education in prison is a form of prison industry, and those working at learning ought to be rewarded for their productivity (Milan, et al., 1979). As with pay for other industry—which, in most prisons, is pennies a day—pay for learning needs to be at a rate that is high enough to be a real incentive and to indicate that we place high value upon it.

6. A LITERACY PROGRAM HAS A NEW-READER'S LIBRARY

A model educational program in prison is supported by a prison library that shelves, however limited its collection might otherwise be, reading matter especially for the new reader and *high-interest* reading matter for everyone. No prison library is likely ever to have enough funds to stock everything to meet the specialized needs of advanced readers and inmates doing research papers in post-secondary work. For these purposes, accommodative arrangements can be made with near-by libraries, especially university libraries with the good will to extend the use of their collection to *distant learners* off-site; CD-ROM and on-line search technology can bring a vast world of knowledge into the prison for relatively little investment; and streamlined and reliable inter-library loan services can be administered by conscientious librarians.[72] Austin MacCormick wrote:

> *Prisoners read, persistently and widely. The libraries, poor as they are, are among the few bright spots in American prisons. Some prisoners take out in a month as many books as the average citizen takes out of his public library in a year....If one could choose only one of the agencies necessary for a well-rounded program of education in a penal institution, he would do well to choose an adequate library. (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 151-152)*

The building of prison libraries was an essential part of the development of prison education beginning in the 19th century, and the history, administration, funding, use, censorship, standards, principles of materials selection, training of librarians, availability as a legal resource, use of *bibliotherapy*, and other special services have been thoroughly discussed in the literature.[73] The American Correctional Association and the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries conducted a survey of prison libraries 30 years ago, at which time standards for prison libraries were published (Library Services Branch, 1965). Unless we have overlooked a recent report, it is time for another survey and a new set of standards (see Williams & King, 1979, for England). Application of these standards helps the prison library to outgrow its identity as a collection of garage-sale quality, donated and outdated volumes, sharing space with a set of law books.

The situation now is patchwork: some prison libraries are well-stocked; others have as mongrel a collection as ever. Some local jails and detention centers would not even have a single book in their *library*, were it not for the Gideons' Bible. Through benign neglect, the better prison libraries came to be modeled on the public library, with the exception of the legally mandated collection of law books present in every federal and state prison. With the gradual maturation of the correctional education profession, some prison educators called for a change in prison libraries that would be, in their opinion, *change-based*—the library as a resource in support of responsible and constructive inmate change (Coyle, 1987). While not a bad idea, a *change-based* library would not necessarily serve the reading preferences, needs, and high interests of all inmate library-users.

The library interests of inmates are as wide and diverse as that of the rest of the population (travel, history, poetry, the arts, health, law, sports, romance novels, and adventure stories), but the adult-reader clientele of the prison library shows a stronger preference than do ordinary library users for informational over recreational reading, for trade and professional information, and for information about family services and family relations, in particular. Inmates who use the library tend to be interested in self-improvement, take part in literary discussion groups, and are inevitably interested in books that the library in their prison does not hold (Burt, 1977). Men tend to express interest in books about the law more than do women; women, more than men, request books about getting along with others. Male inmates like best-sellers and adventure stories on the fiction shelves and people and places in the nonfiction books, whereas women prefer romances and adventure stories in fiction and prison/prisoner literature and humor in nonfiction (Scott, 1979).

The librarian in a model prison library includes inmate library-users on the book-selection committee, and the running request lists compiled by the library clientele are honored as much as possible, just as is done on the *outside*. This reading matter is available for special reading levels in identified areas of subject interest and in support of the prison's educational program.

Prisons with significant populations of Hispanic inmates need to include materials in Spanish, and prisons with significant populations of ethnic-minority inmates need to include materials that would inform those special interests, e.g., African-American studies, Native-American studies, women's studies.

Analogous to the historic ignoring of books for ethnic minorities, a censorial prejudice in the library has also been expressed about sexuality in general, and homosexuality in particular. Austin MacCormick, writing about *censorship*, said that the "two chief problems are books emphasizing sex and those featuring crime and mystery"; and he also said, moreover, that he had "talked frankly with a large number of prisoners on these questions and especially about their attitude towards books dealing directly or indirectly with sex." He then concluded that prison authorities worried themselves much too much about the inmates' reading of sexy books and whodunnits (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 174-175).

We agree with wise Austin. Prisons, being human institutions, are highly sexual places; and, being gender segregated, they tend to house more homosexual activity than is evident in the general population. Being cages in which aggressive and unhappy people are kept against their wills, sexuality as practiced in prisons is very often of the hostile and predatory type. Nevertheless, the connection between sex and violence in prisons is not a necessary one. The SMUTS (Something More Useful than Smut) program demonstrated remarkable success in readers' gains and growth in self-esteem by making available easy-to-read stories that included the emotion-packed language and prison jargon with which inmates are familiar (Bruce-McSwain, 1989). To censor inmate reading material out of prudery about sexuality or homophobia is a violation of the freedom of the press and of inmates' sexual and literacy rights, and is to forget that inmates are adults who know what they like, and that may include ***adult books***.

Prison librarians need to be library ***marketers*** who realize that insufficiently literate inmates have to be ***sold*** on the use of the library, and they need to be taught how to use it (MacCormick, 1931, p. 166; Albert, 1989). The library's open hours, moreover, need to accommodate inmates' work schedules and other rhythms of life *inside*. The library may be more accessible than are counselors and teachers, but not if book-reading inmates are forbidden access to it because their work hours are not coordinated with the library's hours, or if their movement to and from the library is unnecessarily restricted. A study in Maryland showed that, whereas almost all of the inmates were aware of the library and its offerings, one-third of them found it out-of-date and inadequate (even in legal materials, much less other reference materials); the staff were perceived as difficult to talk to about the library; great delays were reported concerning information requests (Vogel, 1976).

All state-prison and local-jail libraries, in view of their typical customers, need to house the most extensive collection possible of high-interest books written especially for the *new reader*. Experiments have demonstrated that reading materials corresponding to inmates' interests are even more important in their gains as readers than is time spent with a teacher (Grissom, 1977). Keeping a fresh supply of high-interest reading material available is a difficult chore because the publishing of high-interest, low-reading-level material is—despite the enormous market for this kind of literature—ignored by most publishers. Especially because library-users in prisons are adults, the librarian needs to make sure that the materials for new adult readers are not of the *Dick and Jane* variety or are only hand-me-down workbooks or texts. *Children's literature* of all kinds needs to be available in prison libraries for those readers who may have been deprived of its richness when they were younger, or for use when children visit.

7. A LITERACY PROGRAM MAKES APPROPRIATE USE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

A model educational program in prison makes full use of available technologies, but subordinates use of the *toys* to the best interests and learning needs of the inmate-students. Over the years, stereopticons, gramophones, lantern slides, filmstrips, film, television, and, now, videos, computers, *programmed learning*, and interactive videodisks have been included in the prison toy box of technical aids (Gehring, 1990, p. 5).

Today, computer literacy is almost as essential in the marketplace and workshop as are the literacies of reading, writing, and ciphering. Students often believe that they have acquired important power in this technological society when they learn to apply computers at even the simplest levels of passive use to play games or to follow simple CAI (computer-aided instruction)

87

menus. They become excited about using computers to practice rather routine skills which they would balk at in paper form.

Fiscally strapped administrators would like to find that computer technology allows the reduction of salaried teaching staffs. Teachers, while often initially timid around the new machines, hope for ready-made solutions to teaching problems. Early efforts by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to use computers were, however, costly failures (McCollum, 1985). The machines were noisy, subject to frequent breakdown, and provided only limited drill and practice in mathematics and language arts. Despite a number of subsequent attempts to aid learning by machine (e.g., the Allen Teaching Machine), not until the advent of the PC (personal computer) did CAI become practicable in the prison setting. PETs from Commodore were used to teach early BASIC programming. Computer Curriculum Corporation introduced their mini-frame-based integrated computer system which met security requirements as it was a stand-alone system with no linkages outside the facility. A survey of the Bureau of Prisons Education Division in 1989 showed that a total of 872 microcomputers were in use in education and for administrative and clerical functions. The greatest percentage were IBM compatibles at 36%, followed by Apple (28%), assorted others (20%), TRS (8%), Tandy (5%), and Commodore (4%). In addition, 222 Computer Curriculum Corporation terminals were in use in 27 institutions (U.S. Bureau of the Prisons, Education Division, 1990). Even so, "if anything has been learned from the Bureau's experience with computer-assisted instruction, it is to move slowly and judiciously and not to select any single system at this time" (McCollum, 1985, p. 39).

As the usefulness of the machines has improved, and educators have become more sophisticated in their use of them, however, computers have become as indispensable in the prison school as they are everywhere else. A CEA survey reported a 90% approval rate for the proposal of a new, technology section in the *CEA Journal*. Computers in use in prisons in 1990 were Apples (II, IIGS, Macintosh), 56%; IBM and compatibles, 27%; Tandy, 7%; Commodores, 5%; and miscellaneous, 5%. Prison educators were interested in learning more about integrated learning systems such as those from Prescription Learning Corporation, Computer Curriculum Corporation, and IBM (PALS), and about educational software appropriate to (in descending order of interest) basic literacy, GED, ABE, writing, applications programs (word processing, authoring, databases, spreadsheets, desktop publishing), vocational education, career awareness, assessment, and social skills. Besides computers, interactive video and satellite television were the other technological tools mentioned (Freasier, 1990; Dobbs, 1984; Bozeman & Hierstein, 1986).

Computers have been used effectively in prisons to support the full range of instruction: data-base retrieval (Leone, 1985); labs for reading, language arts, and math (Hall, 1986); pre-GED instruction (Alessi, 1982; *Low-Level and Non-Reader Program,* 1985; Quick, 1990). The PLATO system, an integrated learning network developed by the Control Data Corporation, has been used more widely and for a longer time than any other system, to teach a considerable range of subjects from basic-skills instruction to post-secondary classes. Opinions of PLATO vary. Perhaps most students and teachers who learned its use thoroughly liked it, but some found it too complicated and see it now as increasingly outmoded. When measured by the TABE, no clear evidence supports the claim for greater achievement by using it (Sandman & Welch, 1978; Diem & Fairweather, 1979; Gilpin, 1982; Angle & Baldry, 1987). All in all, flesh-and-blood teachers are still preferred to electronic ones.[74]

Advantages to learners in the use of computer-aided instruction include learner-controlled pacing, immediate feedback, quicker mastery than with conventional instruction of some content; privacy, individualization of instruction, achievement gains, cost effectiveness, learners gradually taking more and more control of their own learning, flexibility in scheduling, open entry/open exit scheduling, students feeling that they are learning the "modern way."[75] Disadvantages include the rapid obsolescence, constant change, and therefore constant expense of the technology; lack of complete compatibility among various computers and software; high initial cost; possibility that hasty purchases may not be the best choices; requirement of technically sophisticated personnel to set up, maintain, and fix the equipment and to train teachers and others to use it. Much educational software is designed for children rather than adults. It is difficult, especially at first, to integrate what learners do on the computers with the rest of the curriculum. Also, teachers and tutors can be made uncomfortable by their changing roles, as technology seems to take center stage (Askov & Turner, 1990).

Variety and flexibility are characteristics of a fully operational CAI program. In a pre-release program in Ohio, a six-week job-readiness training program, computers were considered essential for testing, assessment, scheduling, instruction, and record keeping (Rose & Williams, 1989).

Computers can be abused in prison, just as they can be anywhere else. Some supervisors warn that inmates' access to software needs to be limited, that inmate computer experts must not be depended on for computer programming integral to running the institution, and that inmates must use only those computers designated for their use (Erlewine & Cavior, 1989). Computer expertise among the administrative staff needs to be great enough so that the prison administration need not depend upon inmate hackers who may be computer sophisticates but not trustworthy humans.

Inmate students who are likely to become computer enthusiasts will enjoy losing themselves for hours in the technology, but not all inmate students profit alike by sitting before a CRT and a keyboard. Above all, the characteristic needs of most people in prison require human interaction. It is, after all, their inability to interact appropriately with other humans that landed them behind bars in the first place. Computers, television, and other machines are inherently limited in what they can do for the lonely inmate who would rather enter into social intercourse and intellectual discourse with a mentor and friend. The *right* teacher is almost always a better idea than any expensive toy. Technology helps, certainly, but technology is only part of the solution to society's ills (Schon, 1983).

Thom Gehring reasoned that current technology serves education well in the dimensions of "classroom discipline" (drill, memorization, teacher-controlled lessons, skills development) and "classroom management" (teachers' assessment of students' intellectual needs). However, when the emphasis is the maturation of the whole person with priorities on affective growth, cognitive and cognitive/moral development, social/cultural learning, and the humanities and the social sciences, existing CAI is insufficient. Gehring warned against five problems in misplaced emphasis on technology in the education of inmates:

1. Goals and strategies are reversed—technology is often perceived as an end rather than a means.
2. Educators who work in prisons lack primary identification with corrections.
3. Resources for education are inadequate.
4. In slim budgets, the choice is often between technology or personnel for education.
5. Inmate students have, for the most part, failed in previous education; even though the latest technology may seem to

offer the promise of increased attention to learning, it may not prove central to learner progress.[76]

Because incarcerated learners are a classic population of *distance learners*, prison educators have specialized in delivering instruction to them through a variety of technological means, from correspondence courses to closed-circuit TV to computers. Like the computers and the correspondence courses (still very much in use in prisons), so also education via television works for some (Paulson, 1977; McLaughlin, 1986; Maxwell, 1987; Collins, 1990), but not for others (Burnham, 1985; Langenbach, et al., 1990).

8. A LITERACY PROGRAM IS THE RIGHT THING TO DO

A model educational program in prison is a reaffirmation of the moral order within which the *outside* society wants the criminally adjudicated to learn to live. A literacy program is society's way of helping *them* to become enough like *us* so that we can tolerate having them live among us. From Jesus' "Golden Rule" to Kant's "Categorical Imperative," and in most other societies as well as the West, the common perception is that at least enlightened self-interest, if not divine compassion, requires that we humans ought to be decent to one another (Enocksson, 1980; Morin, 1981). America is prepared to recognize that the implication of democracy is that literacy is a right (Newman & Beverstock, 1990); and if literacy is a right, then education in prison is the act of a moral society that ought to be guaranteed to one of the least-advantaged, most vulnerable groups in our society. Society with full justice reserves the right to protect itself from the anti-social acts of criminals, but it may not act so as to deprive even criminals of the free use of the mind (Scharf, 1981). How we treat inmates is, in the words of Winston Churchill, a measure of our own morality:

> *The mood and temper of the public in regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unfailing tests of any country. A calm, dispassionate recognition of the rights of the accused and even of the convicted criminal, against the state, a constant heart-searching by all charged with the duty of punishment, a desire and eagerness to rehabilitate in the world of industry those who have paid their dues in the hard coinage of punishment; tireless efforts towards the discovery of curative and regenerative processes; unfailing faith that there is a treasure, if you can only find it, in the heart of every man; these are the symbols which, in the treatment of crime and criminals, mark*

and measure the stored-up strength of a nation, and are sign and proof of the living virtue within it (cited in Wallace, 1992).

I. ASSESSMENT OF LEARNERS AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

1. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION DEFINED

Assessment and evaluation, as used in this report, refer to closely linked, but different, aspects of the evaluation process. Assessment is the process of discovering learners' present literacies by gathering a variety of data and analyzing it in terms of long-term goals and short-term objectives. Evaluation is the examination both of *learner progress* in terms of these goals and objectives and of *program progress* to determine whether the existing structures regarding objectives, strategies, organization, and resources are valid and worthy of continuation, or should be revised. Evaluation during an ongoing program is called "formative," and it is aimed at checking and improving present practice. "Summative" evaluation measures the success of the program at an end of a formal review period.

Purposes of assessment include the following:

- placement of new learners in appropriate programs
- guidance and improvement of ongoing instruction

Purposes of evaluation include the following:

- accountability of instructors and administrators to funding and governing boards
- the evaluation of new programs
- judging of policy success
- new understandings of adult learning (Brizius & Foster, 1987; Farr & Carey, 1986; Lytle & Wolfe, 1989).

Assessment and evaluation, even in the best of worlds, are problematical. More often than not, the results do not inform the people directly engaged in the instruction, may be intimidating to the learner, and may suggest directions to the administrator that are removed from the best interests of either learner or instructor. In prisons and jails, staff and administration are often quite unwilling to have their job assessment depend on their *product* because success at learning by inmates in prison education programs is dependent on many other things in addition to the competency of the staff and administration—dependent, indeed, on factors that we do not yet understand.

Evaluation and its consequence, accountability, are not comfortable subjects for many service providers. People struggling to provide education under challenging circumstances, with antiquated equipment and inadequate funding, understandably feel threatened by reviews of the outcomes of their work. Frequently, because the administrative staff of prisons have little or no training in undertaking, monitoring, or assessing the results of evaluations, the study and reporting of these processes becomes something that is done *to* the prison and the people who live and work there, rather than being an integral part of the program for the mutual informing, improvement, and good of all. To overcome these obstacles, evaluation must be planned from the beginning. *Stricter requirements* for the inclusion of evaluation design in original proposals are needed and future education funding in corrections should depend on compliance. Most grantees do not collect, store, analyze, use, and share student achievement data either with the funding agency or with the educators on site. We agree with the results of a special Congressional initiative that "...this failure reflects a weakness in the field and/or a lack of knowledge in terms of implementing and using program evaluation. It is a need that could be met...through future training activities, technical assistance, or a demonstration project" (Lawyer, Coffey, Grieser, 1987, p. xxix).

2. LIMITS TO RESEARCH

T. A. Ryan, in the conclusion of her review of literacy training and reintegration of offenders, posted this summons to research and corrections communities:

> *A major challenge for the research community is the need for more conclusive research and well-designed evaluative studies, particularly for mandatory literacy training and well-conceived and designed holistic education programs for adult inmates. (Ryan, 1990, p. 32)*

Assessment of inmate progress in terms of predetermined goals and overall evaluation of literacy programs, despite efforts to achieve sophistication in reporting and technical reliability, remains inconclusive. Research on corrections and habilitation continues to be plagued with problems of inaccuracy, inconsistency, and unreliability, even as it was 20 years ago (Adams, 1974). Replication of studies, moreover, has rarely been possible in study of the correctional system (Martinson, 1974), and in the instances where it has been possible, for example *Project NewGate*, different researchers looking at the same data came to opposite conclusions about the effect of NewGate on lowering the recidivism rate.[77]

Efforts have been made to set standards for correctional education in a variety of ways: through public inquiry and testimony before legally competent bodies,[78] numerous state-of-the-art surveys on various aspects of the discipline,[79] publication by prison-education professionals of field-tested standards (Standards, 1988; Johnson, 1978), and surveys of the tests used to place and measure inmate-students' progress in their educational programs.[80] Perhaps the most telling assessment of a program would be the value placed on it by the students themselves. When inmate-students in Great Britain, Canada, and the U.S. were interviewed, their responses, though unsettling to some experts, were supportive of literacy and literacy-based programs.[81]

The next needed step in this examination of correctional literacy instruction is a close and critical meta-analysis of the methodologies of the available research studies to put in perspective their strengths and weaknesses, their contributions and shortcomings, similar to that of Izzo and Ross in the narrower scope of rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents (Izzo & Ross, 1989). Unless this methodological introspection of the field is undertaken, statistical analysis of the effects of prison education projects must remain under a cloud of suspicion about researchers' biases and motives, inadequate grasp of the situation in prisons and jails, defective data, and the essential incapacity of the statistical-analytical approach—as least as it has been developed thus far—as an adequate means of describing this murky complexity. Until then, a unified theory of the field will not be possible.

Researchers intent upon assessment of prison education programs work within certain characteristic limits. Corrections personnel, for whom educational research is an even lower priority than education, often and understandably resist invasion by academics. The outsiders' inquiries for the sake of evaluation may cause embarrassment if the results are uncomplimentary, and their presence at least causes the bother of change in the routine of the institution—work schedules, class times, stirring up the inmates, etc. (Bell, et al., 1983, pp. 3-4). Educational staff, similarly, may view program evaluation with suspicion (Bell, Conard, Laffey, Volz, &

Wilson, 1977), and even inmates—for whose benefit ostensibly the effort is being made—may tend to be resentful of academics. Some inmates make poor informants because they do not trust the researchers; other inmates, bored and lonely, may be too willing to give answers they perceive as wanted or that they hope will hurt people whom they dislike. The researcher must likewise weigh rationally the contributions of facility personnel, who also have their own political and personal agendas, and may assume a variety of postures, from being unwilling and extremely cautious to being gossipy and self-serving informants.

As much as possible, if only temporarily, researchers need to fit into the prison's fabric of day-to-day life. The researcher who comes and goes a few times to collect the sought-for raw but crunchable data, sees the prison only when it is on good behavior, but not over time, through interpersonal exchange, and perceiving the authentic human relationships. Quantitative data alone do not tell the tale. Evaluators need to construct fair and accurate interpretive processes for learning and relating the stories.

Inmates' mental states must be considered as a potential limitation to assessment and evaluation results. At the most benign level, incarcerated people are often distracted by other aspects of their lives in the institution. Living conditions tend to be overcrowded, the noise level is high, privacy is scarce to non-existent, sleep is easy to lose, tensions in relations with other prisoners and with prison authorities are high and electric. Worries about family outside the prison, health problems, and legal-appeal efforts all intrude upon, and can impede, the research process. Most inmates have, moreover, failed at one level or another in education outside of the prison. When confronted by a researcher with test instrument in hand, memories of failure will cloud the typical inmate's mind.

Despite having a *captive audience*—the inevitable prison educator's joke—lack of attendance can be a problem. Interruptions caused by prison routine, uncooperative staff members, transfer to another facility; absences due to illness; individual situations caused by prison bureaucratic processing, conflicts in scheduling work times and other responsibilities, misbehavior and its punishment, self-imposed isolation when prison life becomes overwhelming; and those instances when some inmates are released, some escape (in which case, there will be a total *lockdown*), and some die—all of these occasions add up to a list of obstructions to which few annoyances in institutions outside the prison can be compared. Evaluators of prison programs must expect attrition in the population being studied, just as teachers must expect absences and drop-outs (Bell, et al., 1977, p. 8).

Constraints are imposed on the researcher from *outside*, also. For example, the ***human subjects committee*** at the university, in reaction to unethical research tactics which have been used to exploit vulnerable groups, will have tightened its standards on the use of ***human subjects***, sometimes to a mindless degree that inhibits even normal interpersonal discourse, treating the ***subjects*** as though they were *objects*, rather than as humans with whom one may enter into meaningful conversation.

The demands of empirical social-science canons, moreover, are often difficult to meet. Experimental and control groups are frequently impossible to design in prisons and jails, as random assignment to treatment is rarely possible. When measuring the impact of education on recidivism, for example, in the absence of control groups, the overall return rate for all releasees in the same year is the only point of reference. "Adequate controls are not in place to ensure that the observed results are the result of educational programming and not due to other variables."[82]

3. LIMITS TO THE TESTS

Tests used to identify inmates' personal and learning characteristics are fraught with many limitations, some of them having to do with the unusual situation in which the tests are administered. Because no norm-referenced tests have been designed for prison populations, comparisons are inherently incomplete. When inmates first arrive in an institution, they are hard-put to adjust to their new surroundings. Tests administered during this adjustment period when the incarcerated person's attention is on many other matters, do not accurately reflect how that person might score at another time and under calmer circumstances. Because inmates in general have not had good school experiences, they are unlikely to know how to perform well on tests. They may give adequate answers but lack mastery of the conventions of written language (Gentry & Escoe, 1983). Moreover, many inmates do not care whether they do well on a test that they perceive as silly and invasive. Inmates often perceive testing as just one more instance of coercion by the prison staff (Bellorado, et al., 1986).

Socio-cultural biases in tests, with which educators are now familiar, mean that prison educators, who deal with a higher percentage of ethnic-minority students than do teachers *outside*, must make special efforts either to interpret with care or delete from the assessments in use those elements that have been shown to be invalid for various groups of people (Besag & Greene, 1985).

Most of the tests used in learner assessment and program evaluation yield scores. While the scores may be useful for some kinds of assessments, and although they are frequently required for program evaluation, they may not offer any information descriptive of the actual processes and strategies that inmates use in their literacy activities. While a score may indicate that an inmate is not functioning well on academic tasks, it may tell nothing about why the inmate is responding in that way. Some literacy workers have experimented with an approach to assessment that resulted in a different yield of information (Rigg & Kazemek, 1987). Some of these assessment measures—e.g., a reading-and-recall protocol, the Reading Miscue Inventory, and especially initial interviews focused on the inmate's beliefs and experiences in reading and writing—might prove especially useful in the correctional setting (Goodman & Burke, 1972).

4. APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT

Those who have reflected on the assessment of education programs in correctional facilities have suggested a variety of approaches, especially that assessment needs to be planned for from the beginning so that information can be compiled accordingly and processed along the way (Lawyer, Coffey, & Grieser, 1987, p. xxix).

For many people, assessment is often synonymous with testing. Great reliance and expectations are placed on tests to place learners accurately and reliably and chart their progress. Assessment instruments can be divided into several large categories:

- Standardized tests: norm-referenced (but usually not on prisoners), usually group-administered, low-cost, unrelated to the specific curriculum, often required by funding agencies or policy guidelines
- Criterion-referenced tests: tests for a specific set of predetermined competencies, assuming a continuum of skills development
- Tests of intelligence/psycho-educational functioning: group and individual measures, often unreliable as a measure of individual

ability, tests of learning potential and skills required for schooling

- Informal measures: include informal reading inventories (IRIs), word-list placement tests, a wide range of teacher-developed and administered measures
- Participatory assessments: involve the learners as *co-investigators* gathering and interpreting information

Unfortunately, tests cannot deliver all that is expected of them.

> *There is no one test nor one fixed score that indicates the true level of an individual or group. Because of the errors in these types of standardized tests [ABLE, TABE, CASAS], no major gatekeeping decisions should be based solely on a single "cut" score on a single test. There should always be multiple sources and types of information about people, including past histories of achievements, employment, informal samples of performance using basic skills, references and other types of information that can help in the decision making process. (Sticht, 1990)*

When learners are placed into programs, assessment tools are expected to make good predictions about the learners' likelihood of success in various contexts. Both intelligence and achievement testing predict most accurately a learner's academic success, but the tests are less accurate predictors of life success. The most frequently used test is the TABE, in use in 58% of institutions (Ryan, et al., 1987), but the results of a study of its predictive value for GED scores indicate its insufficiency. Littlefield and Dowling tested two groups, some in formal instruction and some not, two months before they took the GED. The coefficient of determination was .435; the TABE subtest scores explained less than half of the resulting GED scores. Thus, multiple measures, used with caution, must be applied when interpreting the results of assessments.

Ironically, even though correctional institutions contain disproportionately high populations of educationally disabled learners, there are few teachers and other personnel with the special qualifications for devising learning plans on the basis of individual testing. The standardized tests in greatest use do not provide this kind of direction, just as they also tend not to be informative about test takers' other aspects of individuality, either in terms of need, ability, or desires.

Assessment of cognitive function presents its own challenges. It can be approached either directly (by asking what the thinker is thinking) or indirectly (by inferring from behavior or performance on a test). Informal language and cognitive functioning measures can be used to identify learning problems quickly and to facilitate prompt placement into appropriate programs (Koopman, 1983). Ross and Fabiano developed a test battery for cognitive functioning of inmates, including the following:

- for self-control, Kagan's Matching Familiar Figures Test
- for social perspective-taking, Chandler's Role-taking Task
- for concrete/abstract reasoning, Conceptual-Level, Paragraph-Completion Method
- for interpersonal, cognitive problem-solving, the Means-Ends

Problem-Solving Procedure, Optional Thinking Test, Awareness of Consequences Test, or Causal Thinking Test

- for locus of control, Levinson's Internal/External Locus of Control Scale
- for conceptual rigidity, Gough's Rigidity Scale
- for critical thinking, Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal
- for empathy/role-taking, Hogan's Empathy Scale (Ross & Fabiano, 1985)

These and informal-language and cognitive-function measures can be used to identify learning problems and to facilitate placement into appropriate programs (Koopman, 1983).

Before and after release from prison, however, the list of variables that might determine success or failure is daunting. The following collection is a list of variables within several categories—socio-cultural background, including criminal-justice considerations; physiological details; psychological aspects; and educational factors—which have been used as predictive both inside and outside of correctional facilities:

- **demographic data and family background:** age, pre-pubescent/pubescent; gender; ethnicity; place of origin/foreign-born; ESL learner; place of residence—urban, rural; father's absence during childhood; position in family; married/with children; socio-economic status; significant aspects of individuality
- **criminal justice data:** number of weeks/months/years of successful release time before recidivating; types and severity of offenses committed; number and types of prior offenses; number and types of contact with the police and courts; contact

100

of prison-related authorities with inmate's family; type of crime: property v. violence; age at first arrest; record of prior recidivism; number of incarcerations; amount of time incarcerated; length of most recent prior incarceration; level of most recent prior incarceration; how an inmate has been treated in prison (e.g., from incorrigible to trusted in open prisons); facing conditional release, under parole supervision; place of release from prison; type of release from prison; length of probation; degree of community and interagency involvement; intake and release procedures employed by the prison; types of support services available after release

- **educational background data:** preferred learning style; specific learning needs; number of grades completed in school; drop-out status; types of previous prison education, treatment, etc.; correlation of education completion date and release date
- **academic achievement data (while incarcerated):** amount of, and success in, prison classes attended; drop-out from prison education; level of prison education: ABE, GED, post-secondary; increased motivation due to enriched experiences; services and styles of education received while in prison; type of instructional methodology used during prison education; procedures used for course development and implementation; post-release success at job placement and employment
- **ability/disability data:** physical disabilities; I.Q.; functional educational level; mental age; emotional age; degree of awareness; self-image; high-risk v. good-chance selectivity; psychological profile (e.g., aggressive, maladjusted, socialized, cooperative); alcohol and drug abuse; attitude towards work and work-related attitudes; learning-disabled

The foregoing list, even though it is incomplete, is enormous. No general agreement prevails on which factors ought to be accounted for, and no study known to us accounted for all, or even most, of them (Roundtree, et al., 1984). However, such a list is the first step towards building a taxonomy that could be fed into an expert system like CONSULT-I ® (Patrick & Fattu, 1986; Newman, Metz, & Patrick, 1992) to match learner characteristics with strategies most likely to produce successful habilitation. The building of a data base would take years, but results in analogous situations are promising, and a similar approach with the incarcerated would likewise inform us how best to teach literacy to people in prison.

5. APPROACHES TO EVALUATION: HOW TO ASSESS FOR SUCCESS IN A PRISON PROGRAM

From the perspective of the educator, the recidivism question is not the only measure as to whether or not educational programs in prisons *work*. Assessments and evaluations should match goals. The purposes of education in prison need to be defined clearly so that evaluation measures and results will be consonant with what is being measured. Evaluation requires stepping back to view the program as a whole, gathering information that will meaningfully describe the program in question and analyzing that information for the use of learners, instructors, and administrators. In their comprehensive study of program evaluation and learner assessment in adult literacy education, Lytle and Wolfe raised questions in three categories to guide those who plan evaluations.

ADULTS AS LEARNERS

- How is the program designed specifically for adult learners?
- How congruent are the teachers' and learners' concepts of success?
- What roles do adult learners and staff play in setting and revising program goals?

CONCEPTS OF LITERACY

- What is the program's working definition of literacy (literacy as skills, tasks, practices, critical reflection)?
- What information about the cultures, communities, and expectations of adult learners has been used to reach this definition?

EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

- To what extent does the program's design relate to adult learning in everyday life?
- Is the program individually or community oriented?
- How does the program provide opportunities for teachers to expand their instructional repertoires? (Lytle & Wolfe, 1989, p. ix)

Lytle and Wolfe further outlined these 10 critical features of program evaluation and learner assessment:

- Program evaluation in adult literacy education should be conducted both externally and internally.
- Program evaluation should be both formative and summative.

- Program evaluation and learner assessment should involve learners and staff in a participatory process.
- Questions for the design of program evaluation should be generated from theory, research, and evaluation as well as from practice.
- Program evaluation should involve critical reflection on program philosophy and goals.
- Program evaluation should give prominence to the processes of teaching and learning.
- Evaluations should be designed to capture a range of learner and program outcomes.
- Program evaluation and learner assessment require a variety of methods for collecting data over time.
- Evaluation and assessment should be integrated with program functions.
- Program evaluation should be systematic and systemic, enabling stakeholders to make comparisons within and across programs and contexts (Lytle & Wolfe, 1989, p. x-xi).

Questions to ask include the following:

- Have inmate-learners in this program made habilitative progress in literacy?
- Have they gained the reading, writing, and computational literacies that will support their other educational undertakings?
- Have they gained cognitive skills to be able to grapple responsibly with their run-away feelings and pain?
- Have they achieved a sufficient awareness of their common human condition to be able to accommodate their planetary siblings in a social and civil fashion?

A considerable range of behaviors and effects may be taken as indicative of answers to these questions. Each of the following has been used in evaluation of prison education:

- **matters directly related to instruction:** attendance in voluntary programs,[83] enrollment figures, duration in program, grades, degree completion in academic programs, certificate completion in vocational education, scores on achievement and criterion-referenced tests, ongoing participation in education after release, accomplishment of learner–set objectives and goals

- **inmate behavior within the facility:** incidences of violence; disruption caused by lack of understanding of written rules and regulations; general relations among inmates, between inmates and officers, and between inmates and other personnel
- **post-release effects:** employment rates, employment success (level of salary, dependence on welfare), length or stability of employment, criminal activity (rates of rearrest, conviction, return to custody)

Difficult and often impossible though post-release, longitudinal study may be, the above indicators are all data that can be counted, given time and resources. Important information can be gathered in other ways, as well, through interviews, site visits, questionnaires, and the review of official documents.

Having established a satisfactory set of working measures for evaluation of inmate performance and program effectiveness, the following eight-step assessment procedure has been recommended for use in correctional education:

1. Set the purpose of the evaluation.
2. Identify desired outcomes.
3. Formulate the questions to be answered.
4. Select methods for answering the questions.
5. Designate staff to carry out the evaluation.
6. Collect and analyze the data.
7. Report the results.
8. Incorporate the results into present policy and future planning (Halasz, 1982).

The principle that "all things are multiply determined" seems to prevail in double measure when assessing the effectiveness of education in prison. When the graduate of the prison school, now released, commits a new crime and recidivates, who failed? The bottom line is that we do not know enough in detail about that inmate-learner, that program, and that prison to know why one effort worked whereas another did not. What deforming situation arose that kept the benefits of education from having their effect? Although there will always be failures and defeats, how, now, can the program be improved to make successes and triumphs more likely?[84] The checklist in Appendix A is a protocol designed to help answer these very questions.

APPENDIX A: CHECKLIST OF QUESTIONS FOR THOSE WHO PROVIDE LITERACY INSTRUCTION IN PRISONS AND JAILS

The following questions provide for a comprehensive examination of an individual correctional literacy program. The questions were derived from the research literature.

PARADIGMS (EXAMPLES OR MODELS) OF PRISON EDUCATION

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Are adequate educational services available at the correctional facility? **Comment:**		
2.	Does the education of inmates constitute "education in prison" rather than a kind of hybrid "correctional education?" **Comment:**		
3.	Does a comprehensive, non-exclusive, integrated theory of education in prisons exist comprising the many partially effective approaches? **Comment:**		

PARADIGMS (EXAMPLES OR MODELS) OF PRISON EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
4.	Is andragogy (the teaching of adults) rather than pedagogy (the teaching of children) practiced? **Comment:**		
5.	Is learning to learn given as much emphasis as learning to know? **Comment:**		
6.	Is educational self-knowledge valued and promoted? **Comment:**		
7.	Is caring the guiding principle of both the correctional process and of the educational process? **Comment:**		
8.	Is there an emphasis on habilitation rather than warehousing? **Comment:**		
9.	Is there an educational emphasis on human trust? **Comment:**		

PARADIGMS (EXAMPLES OR MODELS) OF PRISON EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
10.	Is security viewed as one among many factors in the overall habilitative process, rather than all-determining single-most important matter? **Comment:**		
11.	Do facility authorities and educators respect each others' respective provinces, i.e., security and education? **Comment:**		
12.	Have steps been taken to promote, where possible and with a reasonable hope for success, cooperation between inmates and staff? **Comment:**		
13.	Is it accepted that educators who identify with their students as well as with their correctional colleagues might serve as mediators between inmates and facility authorities? **Comment:**		
14.	Are joint bar judicial literacy councils established, advised by local literacy experts, organized by literacy providers and employing a Court Literacy Counselor? **Comment:**		

PARADIGMS (EXAMPLES OR MODELS) OF PRISON EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
15.	Does a trained literacy worker who has acquired special recruitment skills and who has achieved a successful record as a literacy tutor take part in formal identification and referral of literacy-needy clients of the court? **Comment:**		
16.	Are state bar associations charged with the task of enlisting the support of their state's institutions of higher education for the purposes of conducting additional research projects, identifying model programs, and undertaking on-site testing of correctional literacy training? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Is the educational program broadly based, an all-inclusive educational fabric that covers the needs of the whole person? **Comment:**		
2.	Is andragogical education, i.e., education designed specifically to meet inmates' adult needs, available? **Comment:**		

108

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
3.	Is education at every learning level available to inmates? **Comment:**		
4.	Does the prison program conform to what we know about the *right* kind of prison education, i.e., does it combine intense, strongly cognitive literacy with humanities instruction that is real-life and meaningful and provided in a just environment? **Comment:**		
5.	What is the purpose of the literacy program, and is the purpose supported? **Comment:**		
6.	Does the program provide experience in democratic and moral-ethical growth? **Comment:**		
7.	Are there alternative campuses depending upon the character and needs of the inmate? **Comment:**		
8.	Is academic counseling a part of the academic program? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
9.	Is diagnostic testing a part of the adult intake process? **Comment:**		
10.	Is the classification process focused on literacy and basic adult education needs? **Comment:**		
11.	What is the definition of "literacy" in the program? **Comment:**		
12.	Does the prison education program include psychologically oriented, self-help efforts that involve inmates in coming to terms with their dysfunctional emotional patterns and faulty intellectual constructs? **Comment:**		
13.	Does the prison education program include medical and psychiatric treatment? **Comment:**		
14.	Are special education programs available through the private sector when these are not available through correctional provisions? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
15.	Are there special-education programs for the learning-disabled? **Comment:**		
16.	Does the program deliver individualized instruction that incorporates cultural awareness in an open-ended, self-paced method? **Comment:**		
17.	Are incentives offered to foster enrollment? **Comment:**		
18.	Are new inmates encouraged to enroll in available classes? **Comment:**		
19.	Are inmates with low reading levels but with average to above-average I.Q. scores especially encouraged to enroll in educational programs, given that they are less likely to enroll than are the inmates with low reading levels and low I.Q. scores? **Comment:**		
20.	Is administrative leverage available to encourage juvenile and adult offenders to enroll in remedial classes? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	**Question**	**Yes**	**No**
21.	Is there a strong recruitment program for women in place? **Comment:**		
22.	Are new programs supported by outside as well as inside sources? **Comment:**		
23.	Are written program goals distributed to everyone involved? **Comment:**		
24.	Do the goals of the program identify and work to eliminate *target behavior* that causes pain? **Comment:**		
25.	Does the program promote prisoner input insofar as possible? **Comment:**		
26.	Is peer instruction and collaborative learning a major aspect of the educational agenda? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
27.	Are women provided instruction in the following? • life-coping skills • self-reliance • self-sufficiency • self-worth • independence and social responsibility • self-preservation • the humanities that sustain the female tradition and experience **Comment:**		
28.	May teachers and students enter into mutual covenants, teach and be taught by one another, and regulate their own academic affairs democratically? **Comment:**		
29.	Are courses offered for officers and inmates, some of which might be taken together? **Comment:**		
30.	Does *problem-oriented programming* involve smaller than normal groups of inmates with common problems and concerns? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
31.	Is the system enrolling inmates in meaningful, practical basic-education programs? **Comment:**		
32.	Does the prison program strengthen inmates' basic reading/ writing/ ciphering abilities while prompting them to think actively about themselves in terms of their histories, values, habits, and futures? **Comment:**		
33.	Does the program include vocational education that ennobles rather than degrades, meets the inmates' own career aspirations and sense of capacity and satisfaction, responds to the needs of the marketplace, and includes instruction in consumer awareness, work attitudes, interview training, and job savvy (how to keep a job and improve within it)? **Comment:**		
34.	Is the educational process accomplished within an atmosphere supportive of success but allowing for failure without rebuke? **Comment:**		
35.	Is the prison's educational program under the oversight of private educational institutions, a State Department of Education, or an independent prison school district, or is it an appendage of the Department of Corrections? **Comment:**		

PROGRAMS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
36.	Are reports of the program kept and published in such a way as to stimulate interest and support in the program both from outside and inside? **Comment:**		
37.	Is follow-up provided for help from human-service agents in getting an acceptable job, finding a place to live, transportation, physical health, the needs of a family, and continuing education? **Comment:**		

EDUCATIONAL STAFF

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Is the teaching staff adequately educated and specifically prepared for the challenges of prison education? **Comment:**		
2.	Have prison educators been given special training to prepare them to teach in an environment that is more ethnically diverse than is the typical public-school classroom? **Comment:**		
3.	Are ongoing educational programs available to correctional staff for achieving professional development? **Comment:**		

EDUCATIONAL STAFF (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
4.	Are all the teachers sensitized to the special needs and characteristics of the educationally disabled? **Comment:**		
5.	Are inadequately prepared teachers required to upgrade their skills? **Comment:**		
6.	Is continuing professional education required for job retention? **Comment:**		
7.	Is continuing professional education appropriately rewarded with pay and status increases? **Comment:**		
8.	Are the skills and characteristics of *effective* prison educators taught to *aspiring* prison educators? **Comment:**		
9.	Is the staff required to meet established standards for achieving and upgrading skills? **Comment:**		

116

EDUCATIONAL STAFF (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
10.	Are salaries commensurate with personal, professional, and educational growth and experience? **Comment:**		
11.	Are rewards available for volunteer and peer tutors? **Comment:**		
12.	Are qualified consultants expert in education, psychology, and law-related matters consistently available to review and evaluate education programs in the prison or jail? **Comment:**		
13.	Do the facility administrators and officers view the work of their educational colleagues as a positive influence in the work of inmate habilitation? **Comment:**		
14.	Are officers aware of how they may be helpful towards the education program? **Comment:**		
15.	Have officers received instruction to equip them with listening skills, an ability to cope with stress, and intervention techniques for use with troubled and troublesome student-inmates? **Comment:**		

EDUCATIONAL STAFF (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
16.	Do the educators respect the role of the correctional authorities? **Comment:**		
17.	Do the educators provide personal and professional contributions to the continuing education of the facility staff? **Comment:**		
18.	Do education providers properly prepare staff for combating low morale, job dissatisfaction, and rapid turnover? **Comment:**		
19.	Does the education staff include a "fixer"—someone external to the correctional institution who will organize and mobilize resources, lobby, publicize, network, and convince? **Comment:**		

118

GOVERNANCE

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Does the correctional facility engage these five involved actors in the educational program? • politically influential members of the public • policy makers • decision makers • correctional administrators • inmates **Comment:**		
2.	Does leadership of both the correctional and education staff do the following? • minimize turf squabbles • use a management style conducive to participation • have the vision to support institutional education **Comment:**		
3.	Is a prison school district separate from the Department of Corrections in place? **Comment:**		
4.	Do the educators exercise authority for educational decisions? **Comment:**		

COMMUNICATIONS

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Are educators and administrators willing to exchange ideas in administration or education planning meetings? **Comment:**		
2.	Is there a free flow of communication between correctional officers and teachers? **Comment:**		
3.	Is there honesty and cooperation between prison authorities and prison educators? **Comment:**		
4.	Are prison inmate-students asked—in andragogical conversation—what they would like to learn? **Comment:**		
5.	Is there communication with the general public about prisons? **Comment:**		
6.	Are reports on the progress of education in the facility made in a timely and appropriate manner to policymakers, legislators, and other decision makers; the politically influential public; the wider correctional and educational establishments; and to inmates in other prisons and jails? **Comment:**		

120

COMMUNICATIONS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
7.	Has communication between Canadian and U.S. researchers been established? **Comment:**		

RESOURCES, LIBRARIES, AND TECHNOLOGY

RESOURCES – FACILITY AND MATERIALS

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Are adequate classroom facilities, equipment, and other support materials available? **Comment:**		
2.	Are scholarships available for annual vocational, technical, and other adult educational endeavors? **Comment:**		
3.	Is TV available for course and recreational purposes? **Comment:**		
4.	Are real-time and private space to engage in study and learning provided? **Comment:**		

RESOURCES, LIBRARIES, AND TECHNOLOGY (CONTINUED)

RESOURCES – FACILITY AND MATERIALS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
5.	Are reduced-difficulty newspapers for inmates available? **Comment:**		

LIBRARIES

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Does the library budget and new-book policy allow for the purchase of materials supportive of both academic and recreational reading? **Comment:**		
2.	Is interesting material on a wide variety of topics available in the facility's library? **Comment:**		
3.	Have inmate preferences in reading been identified? Are they honored? **Comment:**		
4.	Are recommended booklists appropriate to new readers in correctional facilities available? **Comment:**		

LIBRARIES (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
5.	Are materials written at a level that is accessible to the inmates? **Comment:**		
6.	Are inmates allowed full borrowing privileges at public and private library facilities? **Comment:**		
7.	Do the rules regulating the use of the library support genuine study? **Comment:**		
8.	Is the library open enough hours to make reading and studying comfortable and convenient? **Comment:**		

TECHNOLOGY

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Is the purpose for using instructional technology defined? **Comment:**		
2.	Is the use of technology cost-effective? **Comment:**		

TECHNOLOGY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
3.	What are the facility's broad technology goals? **Comment:**		
4.	Are the methods used for the good of the learner or for the sake of the technology itself? **Comment:**		
5.	What are the training needs? **Comment:**		
6.	Is teacher-supported (rather than machine-alone or text-alone) instruction provided? **Comment:**		
7.	What is the teacher/tutor's role in using technology? **Comment:**		
8.	Are teacher-made materials included in the curriculum? **Comment:**		
9.	Are evaluations of new technology published regularly? **Comment:**		

TECHNOLOGY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
10.	Are listings of prisons and jails making successful applications of technology available? **Comment:**		
11.	Are appropriate criteria applied to technology adoptions? **Comment:**		
12.	Are appropriate purchasing guidelines in place? **Comment:**		
13.	Are appropriate purchasing guidelines used? **Comment:**		
14.	Is a location for the technology established? **Comment:**		
15.	Have the security considerations regarding use of the technology been adequately addressed? **Comment:**		
16.	Is consistent, ongoing technological upgrade available? **Comment:**		

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Does the correctional paradigm adequately describe and perhaps even define the educational needs and potential of the inmates? **Comment:**		
2.	Does the testing and diagnostic capacity of the facility coincide with the needs of the inmates? **Comment:**		
3.	Do academic standards exist; are they upheld? **Comment:**		
4.	Are educators and other staff properly trained to carry out the assessments and evaluations? **Comment:**		
5.	Are the inmate-students involved in the planning and implementation of assessment and evaluation processes, both of their own performance and of the overall performance of the program? **Comment:**		
6.	Have inmate learners in the program made habilitative progress in literacy? **Comment:**		

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
7.	Have they gained the reading, writing, and computational literacies that will support their other educational undertakings? **Comment:**		
8.	Have they gained cognitive skills to be able to grapple responsibly with their emotional responses? **Comment:**		
9.	Have they achieved a sufficient awareness of their common human condition to enable them to work with fellow beings in a social and civil fashion? **Comment:**		
10.	Are assessment and evaluation measures valid? **Comment:**		
11.	Is the literacy program learner-centered? **Comment:**		
12.	Are assessment and evaluation reliable? **Comment:**		

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
13.	Can assessment and evaluation measures be efficiently and effectively administered? **Comment:**		
14.	Are the recommendations produced by careful assessment and evaluation heeded? **Comment:**		
15.	Are quantitative measures of program performance available for administrative reporting? **Comment:**		
16.	Are complete records of the educational program and the students' progress maintained? **Comment:**		
17.	Are the results available to the education staff? **Comment:**		
18.	Are correctional education staff members and other prison personnel allowed sufficient time to reflect on present practice and develop recommendations for change? **Comment:**		

128

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
19.	Does the classification process focus on literacy and basic adult-education needs? **Comment:**		
20.	Do advisory panels of educators from within and without the corrections system review assessment and evaluation efforts and make specific and detailed suggestions for improvement? **Comment:**		

JAILS

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Are educational services provided in the jail? **Comment:**		
2.	Do the educational opportunities of the program take into account that the average stay is brief? **Comment:**		
3.	Are jail services (medical, religious, recreational, etc.) coordinated with the services of other social agencies and community organizations, especially in terms of literacy instruction? **Comment:**		

JAILS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
4.	Does the jail have a library? **Comment:**		
5.	Does the jail provide office space for teachers? **Comment:**		
6.	Is post-release follow-up standard procedure? **Comment:**		
7.	Is the jail's educational program equipped to handle a wide range of educational backgrounds and needs? **Comment:**		
8.	Does the educational program of the jail take into account and deal sensitively with the generally failure-oriented educational backgrounds of inmates? **Comment:**		

JAILS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
9.	Does the program provide curriculum that integrates literacy with the following: • work-related social skills? • money management? • alcohol and drug-use awareness? • family and social relations? **Comment:**		
10.	Are the benefits of electronic technology (e.g., computers, closed-circuit TV, radio) available for the program in the jail? **Comment:**		
11.	Does the program involve assessment of learners' needs? **Comment:**		
12.	Does the program allow learners to proceed at their own pace? **Comment:**		
13.	Does the program focus attention (both of researchers and the general public) on situations in jails? **Comment:**		

JAILS (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
14.	Do local literacy coalitions lead in communicating with the sheriff, organizing available resources (churches, schools, colleges, libraries), and in planning and conducting a literacy program at the jail? **Comment:**		
15.	Is the jail program publicized in the local community, and are appropriate organizations and individuals invited and encouraged to take part in the jail program? **Comment:**		

POLICY

No.	Question	Yes	No
1.	Does policy distinguish between hardened criminals, early offenders, and the educationally disabled? **Comment:**		
2.	Are non-violent criminals corrected through life-reforming education rather than through exposure to hardened criminals? **Comment:**		

132

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
3.	Inside high-maintenance prisons, is the investment in habilitative early education and college-access programs rather than in criminal rehabilitation? **Comment:**		
4.	Are basic literacy and other needs met? **Comment:**		
5.	Does the state court employ alternative sentencing to deal with the problem of illiteracy among offenders? **Comment:**		
6.	Is proper diet maintained? **Comment:**		
7.	Are inmates habilitated according to individual needs? **Comment:**		
8.	Are alternatives available for habilitation and sentencing for first-time offenders, non-violent offenders, and the educationally disabled? **Comment:**		

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
9.	Does public awareness, especially awareness on the part of legislators, exist regarding the socially-constructed nature of criminality in America? **Comment:**		
10.	Are policies directed toward alleviating inmate alienation? **Comment:**		
11.	Is there a national, independent agency with legal competency to do the following: • On-site reviews of prisons and jails? • Monitor the rights and needs of inmates? • Report on the continuous and consistent delivery of services in compliance with relevant laws? **Comment:**		
12.	Is there a "National Prison School Board" that can accomplish the following: • investigate the educational needs of inmates? • scrutinize the existing educational programs (or lack thereof) in prisons and jails? • communicate with in-place educational services delivery systems? • report in detail on the state of prison education on a regular and on-going basis? **Comment:**		

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
13.	Is there a coalition (including prison authorities, organized literacy efforts, and neighboring schools of higher and professional learning) to study, help, train, and support volunteer efforts? **Comment:**		
14.	Is the community involved in prison education locally, statewide, and nationally, through the following: • literacy coalitions? • literacy volunteer associations (such as Laubach, LVA, and local literacy initiatives)? • libraries? • churches? • educational institutions (high schools, community colleges, vocational technical colleges, universities)? • private business and industry? • judicial councils? • bar associations? **Comment:**		
15.	Have representatives of these interested bodies been organized into an area or state "prison school board?" **Comment:**		

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
16.	Does this prison school board exercise appropriate authority in the following: • setting educational policy? • hiring teachers? • planning curriculum? • administering the program? • coordinating the affairs of the program with the D.O.C.? **Comment:**		
17.	Is the focus on inmates only, or are the needs of other adjudicated persons and ex-inmates sufficiently addressed? **Comment:**		
18.	Is there an independent, cabinet-level correctional educational department within the federal government? **Comment:**		
19.	Does public policy bend toward public support of the following: • child advocacy? • early detection of family problems that tend to delinquency? • early intervention when problems are found? • parent training to strengthen families? **Comment:**		

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
20.	Are ethnic minority communities supported in their efforts to solve their indigenous problems in order to keep their delinquents from becoming criminals? **Comment:**		
21.	Does the prison function as a secure school? **Comment:**		
22.	Is security administered so that it serves education? **Comment:**		
23.	Are inmate-students allowed sufficient liberty to move about the facility so that they can go to the library, find quiet space and time, meet with their teachers, study with their peers, and read at length? **Comment:**		
24.	When inmates are moved from facility to facility, and when other matters must be regulated according to the needs of security, are moves and changes made with respect for the integrity of the educational program and the personal investment of the inmate-students in a given course of studies? **Comment:**		

POLICY (CONTINUED)

No.	Question	Yes	No
25.	Are means in place to move student-inmates from educational program to educational program, as their educational growth proceeds? **Comment:**		
26.	Do educators exercise authority regarding educational policy and administration of the educational program? **Comment:**		

APPENDIX B: AREAS IN NEED OF FURTHER STUDY

1. Prison statistics, surveys, studies, and reports on the educational situation in prisons and jails, and precise information on the complex educational identity of the prison population

   How many inmates can be described as follows:

   - merely illiterate, never having had the chance to learn to read and write?
   - educationally disabled?
   - learning-disabled?
   - emotionally disturbed?
   - mentally impaired?
   - other severe case individuals requiring special education?

2. A study of the possibility of a national strategic plan, investigating the following questions:

   - the equity of education in prisons and jails
   - for men and women
   - for ethnic minorities
   - for the learning-disabled and educationally disadvantaged
   - for the quality of education in prisons and jails (testing in terms of post-release, such as further education, employment, and social habilitation)

3. A national strategic plan designed to do the following:

   - establish a "National Prison School Board"
   - sustain an independent, legally competent monitoring agency to do on-site, on-demand reviews of any prison or any jail at any governance level in the country in the interests of inmate's civil and educational rights
   - scrutinize educational programs and make recommendations
   - report in detail and on a regular basis on the state of education in prisons in America

4. A "Prison Education Coalition" with participation among the following:
   - Cabinet-level representatives of the federal government and the Federal Bureau of Prisons
   - state D.O.C.s and local sheriffs' offices
   - literacy-activist judges and lawyers
   - inmate support groups and bodies concerned with prison reform
   - colleges and universities with academic programs in Corrections and Correctional Education
   - all other interested parties
5. Lines of communication between federal, state, and local Departments of Correction; universities and colleges; and other institutions of human concern engaging administrators, officers, educators, and inmates
6. Replication of the studies by R. R. Ross and his associates, and the educational methods recommended by them as effective in reducing recidivism
7. Studies of the effectiveness of peer literacy instruction
8. Study of the long-term cost-effectiveness of the private administration of prison and jail educational programs ("privatization")
9. Official correctional policy at all three levels (federal, state, local) with reference to the demands of habilitative education
10. Determination of which is the more effective: educational programs conducted by teachers and staff paid by, and under the administration of, Departments of Correction; or programs conducted by people who are not part of the correctional establishment. This research would include analysis of the different styles of correctional educational structure, among them the following:
    - the D.O.C. as direct educational provider with its own educational organization
    - educational services purveyed to correctional facilities by non-affiliated organizations but under the control of the D.O.C.
    - semi-autonomous *school districts* that correspond as the educational authority to the D.O.C. in its correctional capacity

11. Determination of whether the educational benefits of the G. I Bill have been reported as they relate to correctional facilities
12. Documentation of the contributions of volunteers in the prisons and jails at all three levels
13. Research that matches local conditions and populations with jail programs
14. Research and analysis of situations in jails
15. The non-educational factors that impinge upon the post-release success of inmates who have taken part in prison education
16. The role of the African-American, Hispanic, and Native-American communities in the study and practice of corrections and prison education
17. Support by federal and state governments of African-American and Hispanic organizations in developing a correctional educational focus
18. The educational needs of the non-native-English speaker in America's prisons and of the existing programs designed to meet those needs

ENDNOTES

1 See Mauer, 1991. South Africa was second, with a rate of 333 per 100,000, the Soviet Union was third, 268 per 100,000 population.

2 For descriptions of specific bilingual programs, see Hernandez, 1978; Sainz & Biggins, 1979.

3 Hart, 1987. In an analogous situation, aboriginal Koories in Victoria, Australia, are incarcerated ca. nine times more often than non-aboriginal Australians, and they typically run afoul of the criminal-justice system at an early age and tend to have more prior terms of imprisonment than do other inmates. The first Koorie to become an Aboriginal Welfare Officer was appointed only in 1983, but with considerable success. Now, efforts in Koorie community-based corrections are underway, in recognition of Koorie family and community ties, differing perceptions of reality, and sense of social relations. Correctional staff are increasingly carrying out the recommendations of the Koorie welfare officer, and educational and cultural programs are being mounted to strengthen links among Koorie inmates and their own community and traditions. A task force has recommended the use of Koorie music and culture as a means of rehabilitation, and locating Koorie inmates in prisons convenient for their kin to visit (Barry, 1988). North American authorities might well emulate this Australian example.

4 A similar situation has prevailed in England; see Pearson, 1971.

5 Men typically prefer best-sellers, adventure stories, and books about people and places (Scott, 1979).

6 Learning difficulties in a high percentage of inmates are cases related to physical difficulties of one kind or another, and are thus remarkably easy to remedy, at least in part (McRandle & Goldstein, 1986).

7 The following discuss in various ways the unkept promise of *special education* in America's institutions of correction: Johnson, 1979; Special Education, 1981; Platt, Wienke, Tunick, 1982; Alexander & Caldwell, 1983; Wolford, 1983; Coffey, 1983; Jensen, 1984; Davis & Dickens, 1986; Dwiggins et al., 1986; Gerry, 1986; Warboys & Shauffer, 1986; Special Education, 1987; Coffey et al., 1989, Section 3.

8 Mulligan, 1972, connected learning disability with delinquency through *dyslexia*; Alexander & Caldwell, 1983; Coffey, 1983; Koopman, 1983; Amster & Lazarus, 1984.

9 A sampler of reports on programs includes the following: the federal program at Morgantown, West Virginia (Platt, Tunick, Wienke, 1982); the Special Learning Unit in South Carolina (Conine & Maclachlan, 1982); the Planned Educational Program (Peifer & Cook, 1984); the Youth Reentry Specialist Program (Youth Reentry Specialist, 1986); the Correctional Special Education Training Project (Leone, 1984; Rutherford et al., 1986). Robert Rutherford's assessment of prison education for the disabled includes a bibliography (1966 to 1984) on the subject (Rutherford & Bigelow, 1985), a bibliographical appendix in discussion of major programs (Rutherford et al., 1986a & b), and a checklist of *best practices.* (Rutherford, 1988) Osa Coffey's summary report on education of the educationally disabled is the most recent to cover the field (Coffey et al., 1989).

10 Cass, "Foreword," in Wallack, Kendall, MacCormick, Cass, 1939, pp. 9-10.

11 Holt v. Sarver (II) [309 F.Supp. 362, 379 (1970)]; upheld on appeal by Judge Lay of the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals in Holt v. Sarver (III) [442 F. 2d 304 (1971)], in Carroll, 1974, pp. 482-483.

12 See Comment, 1973, p. 1338; Dwyer & Botein, 1974; Criminal Law, 1975; Scharf, 1981; Strategies of Intervention, 1982; Jensen, 1984. Judicial reform that included the literacy of inmates typically proceeded by way of the High Court's upholding the enlightened laws of the respective states, such as Delaware (Del. Code Ann. tit. II, #6501, Supp. 1971), California (CA Penal Code #1-2002, -2032, West 1970), and New York (N.Y. Correc. Law #36, McKinney Supp. 1973).

13 See the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Acts, and the 1966 Amendment (Aller, 1968); the 1965 Prisoner Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 89-176) (Levison & Easterling, 1974); the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title 1 (Bartell et al., 1977; Reevaluation Needed, 1977; Pfannenstiel & Keesling, 1980); the 1966 Adult Education Act, which required that inmates achieve a minimum sixth-grade reading level prior to release (Hard, 1976); the 1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration, first report; the 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts, which authorized the establishement of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the administrator of the Great Society's effort to improve corrections (Roberts, 1973; Marye, 1979); the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, Section 504 (Gerry, 1986); the 1973-74 Manpower Training Act, which made possible the pre-release instruction in literacy of inmates about to be released, and provided them with some pre-vocational counseling and help with job placement (*Proposal to Train,* 1974); the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), which facilitates education of juvenile inmates; the 1981 Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (Compensatory Education, 1983); and the 1984 Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (P.L. 98-524) (see Johnson, 1979; Zaremba, McCullough, Broder, 1979; Maulfair & Spears, 1981; Post, 1981; Alexander & Caldwell, 1983; Leone, 1984; Price & Vitolo, 1985; Dwiggins et al., 1986; Gerry, 1986; Wood, 1987; Grande & Koorland, 1988).

14 See Strategies of Intervention, 1981.

15 For example, contrast Dwyer & Botein, 1974; Criminal Law, 1975, p. 796; *Wilson v. Kelley* (1968) and *United States v. Wyandotte County* (1972) versus *Collins v. Schoonfield* (1972); Carroll, 1974, p. 482-83; and compare *Clonce v. Richardson* (1974), *Kaimowitz v. Michigan Department of Mental Health* (1973); Criminal Law, 1975, p. 801; Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1983, 1983; Cusick & Wolfe, 1985.

16 In analogy to Wyatt v. Stickney, quoted in Carroll (1974, pp. 480-81), which reads: "When patients are so committed for treatment purposes[,] they unquestionably have a constitutional right to receive such individual treatment as will give each of them a realistic opportunity to be cured," one could argue: "When illiterate inmates are so committed for rehabilitative purposes, they unquestionably have a constitutional right to receive such individual instruction as will give each of them a realistic opportunity to become functionally literate." Because penal adjudication obstructs the inmate's access to doctors and hospitals, but the Constitution guarantees the inmate-citizen's "right to life," the Department of Corrections is made liable for the free medical care of inmates in its keeping. Similarly, on the assumption that inmates, once they had seen the need, would avail themselves of education were they to be on the outside, one could argue that the Department of Corrections is made liable for the lifelong education of

the people whom it oversees. This would mean that inmates have a "right to education" not yet Constitutionally guaranteed even to free citizens.

17 Comment, 1973; Smith, 1987; see Watts, 1990, for a bibliography of works on inmates' legal assistance. A survey in 1986 revealed that 27 states provided law libraries alone, three others provided attorneys alone, and the remaining 20 provided both libraries and attorneys. (Farrar, J. R., 1986) Earlier law requiring access both to legal libraries and to legal counsel has been mitigated to restrict access to either legal counsel or libraries. This oxymoronic status of the law makes law books available to inmates whether they can read them or not.

18 See Arkansas Action Plan, 1988, in response to the Court's requirements in *Holt v. Sarver* (1970); *Rutherford v. Hutto* (1974); Criminal Law, 1975, pp. 793-794. In European countries, education in prisons has been spotty just as in the United States; some countries have been advanced in their thinking about literacy instruction and vocational education of inmates, and some have not. The Council of Europe, moving towards 1992 and the economic uniting of the European States, in Recommendation No. R(89) 12--suggested policy, but not yet law—recommended access to education for inmates, including classroom study, vocational education, P.E., cultural and artistic education, and social [moral] education; education should have equal status with work in the prison scheme of things; staff members are to be trained in appropriate adult education methods; special attention must be given to educationally deficient inmates; vocational education should involve the total development of the person and be correlated to the labor market; education in prison should involve the outside community as much as possible (Education in Prison, 1990).

19 Federal Register 56(84) 28 CFR Part 544; McCollum, 1990; Justice to Force Prisoners, 1990. A Congressional attempt to mandate similar literacy laws for state prisons and local jails was mitigated to an encouragement of voluntary literacy programs because federalist Senators could not find enough money to pay for the program, thus allowing states'-rights Senators successfully to oppose the legislation (Education Daily, 1991, July 8, p. 3; 1991, July 10, p. 2).

20 See Peak, 1984. The comparably conservative Thatcher administration in Great Britain manifested a similar lack of legislative support for prison education, including budgetary cutbacks and new sentencing arrangements that ran counter to education of inmates. A countervaling committee of the House of Commons proposed, among other reforms, the establishment of an educational college within the prison system (House of Commons, UK, 1982).

21 Resource and Reference Guide, 1978; Building Partnerships, 1985; Smith, 1987. On specific states, see, for example, Shadoian, 1976; Bal & Mahon, 1978, on California; Special Education, 1981, on Virginia; Educational Services, 1982, on New York; Russell & Salm, 1989, on Wisconsin.

22 Berry, 1971; Chilton, Simpson, 1972; Wax, 1972; Gold, 1978; Mesinger, 1984a; Davidson, J., 1989. School failure is not merely an effect of socio-economic breakdown; perceptual disorders are disproportionally high among delinquent youths, and speech disorders are found among them twelve times more frequently than in the general population (Murray, 1976; Gagne, 1977; Bell et al., 1983, p. 1).

23 No sexism is to be inferred from this intentional use of gender-specific language, just as no racism is to be inferred from our reporting the statistics of ethnicity: It is important to be clear statistically about whom we are speaking. Just under 12% of the youths held in public juvenile facilities are

female, and their numbers have declined by 8% over the past few years. Similarly, the number of White boys has been declining, while the number of Black and Hispanic boys has been increasing. By far the large majority of juvenile delinquents are boys, and most of them, persons of color. More than 88% of the juveniles held in custody in all facilities are boys (with more than a 93% rate for boys in long-term facilities), 60% are African-Americans, and 15% are Hispanic (with a higher rate of Hispanics in long-term facilities); 90.4% of these children did not make it through high school, and 58.3% are middle-school drop-outs (Beck, Kline, Greenfeld, 1988; Allen-Hagen, 1991).

24 Powell, 1975; Shinbaum, 1977; Alternative Programs, 1985; early intervention is cheaper than incarceration (Blew, McGillis, Bryant, 1977), and "it works" against recidivism (Heath, 1977; Niven & Readio, 1977; Hawkins & Wall, 1980).

25 Educational Services, 1982; Pasternack et al., 1988; Traynelis-Yurek & Giacobbe, 1988; see also *Breakthrough for Disadvantaged Youth, 1969*; Miller & Windhauser, 1971; *Study of Reading Disorders*, 1972; *Project Intercept*, 1974; Genesee County, 1972; Washington, 1972; California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973, 1977; Ratcliff, Taylor, Joine, 1974; Ruth, 1974; St. Louis, 1974; Shadoian, 1976; Arizona: Department of Education, Title 1, 1977; Bartell et al., 1977; Blew, McGillis, Bryant, 1977; Gagne, 1977; Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Bal & Mahon, 1978; North Carolina, 1979; Gormly & Nittoli, 1974; Griggs, 1975; Florida Youth Services, 1976 & 1977; Platt et al., 1977; Eller, 1979; Rothaizer, 1981; Geizer, 1982b; Rousch, 1983; Schlossman, 1983; Sherer, 1983; Waksman et al., 1983; Maddox et al., 1984; *Youth and the Justice System: Can We Intervene Earlier?* 1984; van Nagel et al., 1986; Grande, 1987; Roberts & Schervish, 1988; *Reading Program Profiles in Correctional Institutions*, n/d.

26 Studies indicate that one-shot programs in literacy alone are inadequate. (California Department of the Youth Authority, 1971, 1977; Weathers & Liberman, 1975; DeLong, 1978).

27 Miller & Windhauser, 1971; *Study of Reading Disorders*, 1972; Genesee County, 1972; Washington, 1972; Ratcliff, Taylor, Joine, 1974; Ruth, 1974; St. Louis, 1974; *Project Intercept*, 1974; Gormly & Nittoli, 1974; Griggs, 1975; Florida Youth Services, 1976 & 1977; Platt et al., 1977; *Project Read*, 1977; Blew, McGillis, Bryant, 1977; Bachara & Zaba, 1978; McGurk, Bolton, Smith, 1978; *To Make a Difference*, 1978; Eller, 1979; North Carolina, 1979; Rothaizer, 1981; Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1982; Sherer, 1983; *Youth and the Justice System: Can We Intervene Earlier?* 1984; Polivka, 1986; Grande, 1987; Traynelis-Yurek and Yurek, 1990.

28 A number of studies on the mental ability of male juvenile delinquents indicated that they are more intelligent and capable than the students for whom the educational programs in use were designed (Harper, 1988).

29 *Breakthrough for Disadvantaged Youth*, 1969; Arizona Department of Education, Title 1, 1977; California Department of the Youth Authority, 1973 & 1977a, b; Shadoian, 1976; Bartell et al., 1977; Bal & Mahon, 1978; Gagne, 1977; Knox, 1980; Geizer, 1982b; *Current Trends*, 1983; Rousch, 1983; Schlossman, 1983; Maddox et al., 1984; *Programming for Institutionalized Youth*, 1984; van Nagel et al., 1986; Roberts & Schervish, 1988; *Reading Program Profiles*, n/d.

In addition to these, among the many programs reported in the literature as designed especially for the literacy instruction of youthful offenders, the following recent or on-going programs seem to us to be exemplary for their design and/or effects: Bradfield et al., 1975; Ridgecrest in Alabama (Earnest et al., 1975); *Project Read* (Project Read, 1977; *To Make a Difference*, 1978; Carsetti, Heiss, Pierce, 1979); Cook County, Illinois, and Jackson County, Florida (Kelley, 1978); PREP (Filipczak, Friedman, Reese, 1979); Operation IDEA in Chicago (Knox, 1980); Phoenix in Akron, Ohio (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1982); Shelby County, Tennessee (Bobal, 1984); Bluewater Secondary School in Ontario (Carroll, 1986); VisionQuest in Tucson, Paint Creek in Ohio, and Key Tracking in Massachusetts (Greenwood, 1988); Monteith in Ontario (McLean, 1986); Snyder-Union County in Pennsylvania (Herbst & Sontheimer, 1987); use of the neurological impress method in Virginia (Traynelis-Yurek & Yurek, 1990).

30 McGurk, Bolton, Smith, 1978. When recidivism rates first began to be studied scientifically, some failed to perceive both the connection between recidivists' low levels of literacy and their high rate of return to prison, and the connection between their illiteracy and original criminality (Tappan, 1960, pp. 58-64).

31 Austin MacCormick, the father of contempory prison education, observed in 1931: "From the first[,] education was the backbone of the [reformatory] program. High hopes were held for the reformatories and exaggerated claims were made as to their efficacy in turning young prisoners from crime. Finally, as increasing numbers of reformatory graduates appeared in the prisons, penologists began to recognize the fact that these institutions were failing not only as educational institutions but also as reformatories." (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 272-3) Citing a study by Glueck (1930) that set the recidivism rate for the Massachusetts Reformatory at 80%, even the optimistic advocate of prison education, Austin MacCormick, and Richard Cabot, in his introduction to MacCormick's report, grieved that the reformatory system "does not work." MacCormick concluded that "...with few exceptions the reformatories have failed as educational institutions. In the greater number this is due to the fact that education has become a mass treatment process in which a stereotyped routine is followed. Individualization is almost totally lacking" (MacCormick, p. 273-4).

32 *New Careers*, 1967; California Department of the Youth Authority, 1971; Broadbent, 1973; Stowell, 1974; Maciekowich, 1976; Mace, 1978; Stevens, 1981; Orsagh & Marsden, 1984; Linden et al., 1984; Knepper, 1989; Langenbach et al., 1990; for a debate over whether the Great Society's excperimental Project NewGate was successful at reducing recidivism or not, see Clendenen et al., 1979, who said it was, versus Seashore et al., 1976, p. 90, who said it was not.

33 She cited Schumacker, Anderson, & Anderson, 1990; Rice, 1980; Anderson D.B., 1981; Lee, 1981; Stevens, 1981; Shuman, 1976; and Mace, 1978.

34 The programs that Ryan mentioned as especially effective are as follows: the Huntington Prison Literacy Project, a Laubach Literacy International program in Pennyslvania (Correctional Education Association, 1989); the Oklahoma Prison Literacy Project, a joint effort of the Departments of Corrections, Education, and Libraries, and volunteers from 15 local literacy councils (op. cit.); the Individualized Life Skills Program in Georgia, focusing on health education, family and civic skills, and consumer education (Ryan, 1982); a technology-assisted (radio, TV, computers [PLATO]) program in the Bexar County Detention Center in San Antonio, Texas (Diem & Knoll, 1981); a Kohlbergian program of cognitive-moral development (Ventre, 1982); a mathematics instruction program in Louisana designed to enhance inmates' self-esteem (Roundtree, Edwards, Dawson, 1982); the Educational Support Program in South Carolina designed to ease female inmates back into society through bridging their exit from prison by way of education, beginning their education in prison and then continuing their education outside in the

community (Ryan, 1989); the Folloup Model Program in Norway, another transition program to link education in prison with education outside of prison as a means of bridging (*Select Committee of Experts*, 1989).

35 Ross & Fabiano, 1985, pp. 97-98; see especially their chart of comparisons on pp. 100-113.

36 They summarized the following reports: "effective cognitive" programs as reported by Schwitzgebel, 1964; Truax et al., 1966; Sarason, 1968; Ostrom et al., 1971; Alexander & Parsons, 1973; Chandler, 1973; Phillips et al., 1973; Carkuff, 1974; Barkwell, 1976; Wade et al., 1977; Kloss, 1978; Ayers et al., 1980; Lee & Haynes, 1980; Platt et al., 1980; Seidman et al., 1980; and "effective non-cogitive" programs as reported by Baron et al., 1973; Davidson & Robinson, 1975; Wagner & Breitmeyer, 1975; Cox et al., 1977; McCord, 1977; Quay & Love, 1977; Kelley et al., 1979; O'Donnell et al., 1979; Shore & Massimo, 1979.

37 The "ineffective cognitive" program was reported by Weathers and Liberman, 1975.

38 The "ineffective non-cognitive" programs were reported by Taylor, 1967; Sloane and Ralph, 1969; Ketterling, 1970; Sowles and Gill, 1970; Truax et al., 1970; Ahlstrom and Havinghurst, 1971; Empey and Lubeck, 1971; Kassebaum, 1971; Berleman et al., 1972; Alexander and Parsons, 1973; Poorkaj and Bockelman, 1973; Shea, 1973; Handler, 1975; Liberman et al., 1975; Ross and McKay, 1976; Davidson and Wolfred, 1977; Waldo and Chiricos, 1977; Kim, 1978; Byles and Maurice, 1979; Lichtman and Smock, 1981.

39 Ross & Fabiano further supported their conclusion by appeal to an extensive meta-analysis of the effects of 111 programs on the recidivism of delinquents between 1960 and 1984, as reported by C. J. Garret. With an inter-rater reliability of .95 in the coding scheme, Garret found that among the methodologically most rigorous studies, the greatest effects were in the "cognitive-behavioral" programs (Garret, 1984).

40 Genesee, 1972; Washington, 1972; *Project Intercept*, 1974; Ratcliff et al., 1974; Ruth, 1974; Monroe et al., 1975; Galley & Parsons, 1976; Blew et al., 1977; DeLong, 1978; Holder, 1978; Mace, 1978; Walton, 1978; Bachara & Zaba, 1979; Clendenen et al., 1979; Wolford, 1979; Duenkel & Johnson, 1980; Blackburn, 1981; Stevens, 1981; Wolf & Sylves, 1981; Berckhauer & Hasenpusch, 1982; Thorpe et al., 1984; Walsh, 1985; Macdonald, 1986; Stevens, 1986; Lee, 1988; O'Neil, 1988.

41 Religion has proved to be the most enduring style of correctional educational paradigm and a sure avenue for literacy delivery, from the penance (from which the word *penitentiary* is derived), Quaker meditative silence, Bible-reading, and resident chaplains, to many new styles of prison ministry, to the neo-orientalism of the *new religions*: e.g., Werner Erhard & Associates' *est training* (now called *Forum*); the Hindu meditation practices of the Maharishi people—Unified Field Based Rehabilitation (Ellis D., 1979; Bleick & Abrams, 1987), and of Bo Lozoff and the Human Kindness Foundation (Lozoff, 1985); the Human Potential Seminar (McHolland, 1976; Hamm 1987b); a Buddhistic approach, the *criminology of peacemaking* (Quinney, 1987; Pepinsky, 1987); and various Christian efforts, such as The Living Love Way, A Course in Miracles, and the Christian Clown Ministry. Prison Fellowship, of Washington, DC, publishes a directory of organizations in the U.S. and elsewhere that work with inmates in counseling, education, employment, economic aid, prison reform, and other services for inmates. (*Resource Directory*, n/d) Many inmates turn to the consolation of religious groups (and self-help groups and gangs) precisely on account of the failure

147

of the prisons to reform or prison-education programs to habilitate (Irwin, 1980; Abdul-Mu'Min, 1985: Jacobs, 1985).

42 Jones, 1977; more studies involve conclusions indicating the failures of vocational education than indicate the failures of literacy education. Some studies indicate that vocational-technical education and cognitive/literacy education make effective partners in reducing recidivism (Broadbent, 1973; Braithwaite, 1980; Tahash, 1980; Mitchell, 1981; Mason et al., 1978; Cogburn, 1988; Schumacker et al., 1990).

In situations where vocational training and academic education are mixed, whereas some studies indicate that the latter is more effective at reducing recidivism than is the former (Beha, 1977), other studies indicate that the former is more potent than the latter (Hackett, 1988; Schumacker et al., 1990). Vocational education is neither worse nor better than group therapy in improving inmates' attitudes (Daniel, 1984). In Oklahoma, an effort with non-violent inmates called the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program appears to have done as well as vocational education or any other approach merely by emphasizing self-discipline and regimentation (Udell et al., 1989).

Some studies indicate that vocational education does not lower the recidivism rate at all (Lewis et al., 1978; Fize, 1981; Englander, 1983), and that, in fact, vocationally-technically trained inmates recidivate at a higher rate than do control groups (Boyle, 1978; Cross-Drew, 1984; Davis & Chown, 1986). One study showed that vocational education in prison, and inmates' job placement outside of prison, were unrelated, thus demonstrating the essential uselessness of vocational education in prison, which is notoriously unrelated to the work marketplace on the *outside* (Pelzer, 1985).

Some studies allow one to argue for a positive effect of vocational education on recidivism in some cases (Hudson, 1971; Schaeffer & Shannon, 1983; Dollar, 1988; Hassell, 1988; Lattimore et al., 1990), whereas other studies show a mixed effect not only in terms of reducing recidivism but also in terms of making those who have been trained more employable (Gleason, 1978; Bennett & Chatman, 1979; Sadd et al., 1983; Project REAL, 1984; MacDonald & Bala, 1987). One experiment seemed to work because volunteers from labor unions helped to train probationers (Winick & Saltman, 1982).

Unlike the evidence on cognitive education, the statistical studies leave us with irreconcilably conflicting data regarding vocational education and recidivism. Like the evidence on cognitive education, vocational-technical education needs to be studied and implemented from new and better viewpoints (*Correctional Information Decision System,* 1979; Coffey & Carter, 1986), and when it is done *right*, it seems to work a lot better. (Atteberry & Tacker, 1978; Wirth, 1987; *Oversight Report on PRIDE,* 1988; see Khan, 1982, for a description of an even worse situation in India.) "Right" in respect to vocational-technical education—in addition to being coupled with cognitive/literacy education (Downing et al., 1987)--seems to include the following requirements:

- Vocational education needs to be meaningful and intelligent and not *beneath* the inmate's self-conception as a worker (Fize, 1982; Gleason, 1986; Collins, 1988b; Imel, 1990). Austin MacCormick pointed out over a generation ago that one of the things that *doesn't work* is the mentality that prevailed then, and is still endemic now, among those vocational educators who hold a condescending bias towards inmates who tend to come from the socio-economic underclass. This classism in prison vocational education is a perception that inmates really ought to make excellent auto mechanics and cosmetologists, rather than intellectuals and professionals (See MacCormick, 1931, pp. 272-273).

- Vocational education needs to be about some form of industry or employment that is needed and respected in the *outside* economy, in a field where jobs are available in *the real world,* and shall prove appropriately remunerative. It needs, moreover, to be under the supervision not of corrections officers (who are not necessarily trained or experienced as successful business persons or business educators). The move to reorganize vocational education in prisons as *workplace literacy* under supervision from the private sector, is called *privatization,* and it has important implications for all kinds of prison education.

- Vocational education needs to be properly completed, as those who enroll in a vocational program but do not finish are as liable to recidivate as those who never enrolled (Umer, 1976; Berckhauer & Hasenpusch, 1982).

- All the other many control factors detailed in respect to cognitive education also affect vocational education, and they are as elusive in this connection as in that (Pownall, 1971; Shuman, 1976; Lewis et al., 1978; *Employment Research Project,* 1980; Markley et al., 1983; Ciccone & Friedenburg, 1988).

- Human services agents, finally, need to help former inmates find work (Sedlak, 1975; Whitehead et al., 1987).

Helen Cogburn, in discussing recidivism and what has been *right* about the voc-tec education of inmates at J. F. Ingram State Technical College in Alabama, confirmed our perceptions about what is *right* in literacy programs, when she concluded as follows:

> *The education Ingram State provides to incarcerated individuals differs in several regards from the education provided to prisoners in other areas of the nation. It is fully accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, operates under the Alabama Board of Education, is located outside the confines of the prison system, and maintains security only through the use of perimeter guards. The academic setting and atmosphere is the same as for institutions serving more traiditional students. Ingram State is not simply a prison industry (Cogburn, 1988, p. 1).*

Even with Ingram State's good record—a low, combined recidivism rate of 13.5% from 1976 to 1986, and a high, combined success rate of 86.5% for non-recidivating students—recidivism figures had been creeping up during the period from 1983 to 1986. Cogburn hoped to improve the situation by means of more careful selection of students "at an appropriate stage in their incarceration"; development of job sites for inmate graduates; matching student skills with available activities and programs; and hiring a new staff person to facilitate the proper placement of students, monitor their retention and progress, and serve as their advocate after graduation (Cogburn, 1988, p. 7).

One wonders whether what had worked at Ingram State in the 1970s was no longer working with a new type of criminal in the 1980s. According to Gary Scott, Director of Education at Indiana Women's Prison for 19 years, the increased use of cocaine and crack during the 1980s was the main new element adversely affecting the recidivism rate (Scott, private communitcation, 1991).

149

Most vocational education prison programs are not like Ingram State. One of the most recent reports on vocational education in prisons yielded generally a negative judgment: lack of funding, too few programs, outmoded equipment and materials, limited space, inadequate training for women (Imel, 1990). The shelves are filled with manuals for setting up vocational education programs, and the journals abound with expressions of opinion about the best way to run programs; nevertheless, the negative results of a study reported in 1984, including the judgment that research on vocational education is inaccurate, inconsistent, and unreliable, would be the results today of another were a similar survey of voc. ed. in U.S. prisons to be conducted. (Jengeleski, 1984; see further negative judgments: Kershner, 1984; Rowh, 1985; Nelson et al., 1988).

In the words of one anonymous vocational-education inmate trainee: "Prison, where they cage you like an animal, treat you like a child, and pay you like a slave, is not a very good place to learn to be a responsible worker."

43 Fascinated with the *criminal mind,* some ensconsed themselves in the prisons with a concern to "treat" inmates. As medical practitioners with the legal competence to write prescriptions, what they are unable to undo with the nut-pick of psychology, they put at bay with prescription drugs. Some bourgeois psychiatric fundamentalists, in frustration over the failure of the therapy paradigm either to save or heal, are ideologically predisposed to disregard the claims of people who are not necessarily ill but who are irreconciably *different*—as celebrated in Ken Kesey's novel One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest. Some clever inmates capitalize on some psychologists' naivete by turning small-group counseling sessions into opportunities to boast about their anti-social behavior and increase their status in prison society. (Housewright & Fogel, 1977). Nevertheless, because many inmates are mentally ill, disoriented, and delusional, a medical paradigm has in principle a certain a priori efficacy.

Even so, the therapy paradigm having been capable of saving only a few, its failure resulted in defections to other paradigms (Cosman, 1980; Daniel, 1984), among them behaviorism (B. F. Skinner) (Dominguez et al., 1976; Ayllon et al., 1979). That theory having enjoyed its greatest popularity at about the time of the Great Society, experiments in programmed instruction and reinforcement theory being undertaken notably at the Draper Correctional Institution in Alabama (McKee, 1972), it, too, has been judged to deliver less than its theorists promised (Jeffrey, 1968; Gehring, 1988b).

44 H. S. Bhola, private communication to Caroline Beverstock, Bloomington, Indiana University, 1990.

45 *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York, Reports 1871 to 1873,* Vol. 7, pp. 187-188; cited in Wallack et al., 1939, p. 5.

46 The penal paradigm easily coalesces with the *actuarial paradigm*—the taxpayer's *ticket shock* at the increasing price of incarceration. Resentful tax payers want criminals properly punished for their misbehavior, not given a free ride and a free education (Ross and Fabiano, 1983; see Wagner, 1976; Bell, R. et al., 1979; Pollack, 1979; MacNeil, 1980; Pritchard, 1980).

47 Cohen & Taylor, 1972; Roberts, 1973; Curry, 1974; Lipton et al., 1975; Omark, 1976; Romig, 1978; Day, 1979; Chaka, 1980; Decker, 1980; George et al., 1980; Kandal, 1981; Middleton, 1981; Brakel, 1982; Goldin, 1982; Millott, 1982; Goldin & Bean, 1983; Gribben, 1983; Pecht, 1983; Thomas 1983a; Goldin & Thomas, 1984; Collins, 1988a.

48 Hamm, 1988, p. 147; Ohlin, 1986; Owram, 1986. In the face of this hopelessness among some correctional administrators, severe complicating factors such as unprecedented violence, severe crowding, and racial conflicts (Carroll, 1982; Blumstein, 1983; Austin & Krisbert, 1985; Braswell et al., 1985; Dilulio, 1987) have led as well to disillusionment among the inmate population about the prospect of rehabilitation (American Friends Service Committee, 1971; Morris, 1974; Johnson, 1987).

49 Ragan, 1962; although public braggadocio is now passé (Brakel, 1982; Goldin & Thomas, 1984), the situation is little changed; people in uniforms tend to swagger. Some women's prisons are still under the control of males (Schweber, 1977).

50 Eggleston & Gehring, 1986; Gehring, 1988a, 1989; see *National Conference on Prison Education*, 1981, for an early statement of the emergent Canadian plan; see Holder, 1988.

51 Foley-Jones & Broadhurst, 1977; Pennington, 1979; Braithwaite, 1980; Price & Price, 1980; Davies, 1981; Rauch, 1981; Deboe, 1982; Duguid, 1982; Fizzell, 1983; Brodt & Hewitt, 1984; Meussling, 1984; Boucouvalas & Pearse, 1985; Rivera & Walker, 1985; Srivastava, 1986; Fox, 1987; Wiley, 1988; Sua, 1989; see Lindeman, 1926.

52 See Kenneth Martin's brief history in Reagen & Stoughton, 1976, pp. 31-48; see Thom Gehring's writings mentioned throughout this report. He more than anyone else illuminates his understanding with an awareness of the history of education in prisons.

53 See *Reading Program*, 1974, the first systematic attempt to supply literacy educators with a profile of the many kinds of reading programs available for use in prisons and jails, and to give sketches of existing programs; Pollack, 1979; Gold, 1983; and especially McGrail, 1984, a report on literacy programs in general, including adult literacy programs in prisons.

54 See Prisoner Education, 1978, produced in Australia; see the annotated bibliography in Conrad & Cavros, 1981.

55 Herron et al., 1973, a survey of all superintendents, assistant superintendents, and education directors at all of the major federal and state adult correctional facilities listed by the American Correctional Association in 1972; Dell'Apa, 1973; Kilty, 1977; Loeffler & Martin, 1982, on the basis of a questionnaire survey of educational directors in state D.O.C.s as recently as 10 years ago, came to the shocking conclusion that no ABE curriculum for inmates existed nationwide.

56 Peak, 1984, on the effectiveness of delivery of post-secondary education in state prisons; Imel, 1986, on adult education in prison vis-à-vis litigation by and for inmates in behalf of their educational rights, parity for female inmates, education for the handicapped and the learning disabled, and multi-agency and post-release services.

57 MESA, 1985, is a guide to model programs premised on a survey of the literature and research project on 25 vocational and academic skills programs in prisons, especially those resulting from interagency cooperation; Sawyer & Cosgrove, 1989, is a report on effective programs in three types prison settings: juvenile, local jails, and prison education. The programs mentioned are Buena Vista Correctional Facility, Garrett Heyns Education Center, Huntingdon Prison Literacy Project, Kansas State Industrial Reformatory, Lebanon Correctional Institution, Maryland Correctional

Training Center, Maryland Correctional Institution, Mt. McGregor Correctional Facility, Muskegon Correctional Facility, Oklahoma Prison LIteracy Project, and Petersburg Federal Correctional Institution. See also Policy Institute, 1973; Sawyer & Cosgrove, 1989; and reports on the highly touted Newgate projects: Lorton, 1973; Reagen & Stoughton, 1976; Seashore et al., 1976; Clendenen et al., 1979.

58 Policy Institute, 1973; Linsenberg, 1975: programs in New Jersey and New York; Lewis & Fickes, 1976: programs in Pennsylvania; Tulardilok, 1977: programs in southern Michigan; Phillips & Wagner, 1977, turned in a severe policy review of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Nixon and Bumbarger, 1983: programs in Canada; CUNY Tech, 1984: many programs, including prison education; Moving California, 1987: grand policy-planning in California [the results of this effort, like so many others, have been anonymously reported to be disappointing]; Arkansas Action Plan, 1988: adult-literacy program plans in Arkansas, including in the prisons.

Reagen & Stoughton, 1976, p. 59, backed by the Ford Foundation, ranged in their descriptions from Dickensian nightmares to bright hopes, and concluded, as one must today: "We oberved and were informed of the widest possible range and quality of imaginable prison education programs during this study. In some cases, a prison would have a reasonably full service program, while nearby, another prison would have barely any program at all."

See especially two symposia containing statements by leading experts: Morin, 1981, with contributions of significant theory by Lucien Morin, J. W. Cosman, Stephen Duguid, William Forster, J. D. Ayers, T. A. A. Parlett, Morgan Lewis, Peter Scharf, James Rest, William Jennings, Ian Wright, and Douglas K. Griffin; and Wolford et al., 1986: Bruce Wolford on literacy instruction, Osa Coffey on trends, Paul Moke on inmates' rights, Robert Rutherford and Michael Nelson on the legal mandate for serving the educationally disabled, John Waidley on career education, and John Littlefield on post-secondary prison education.

59 Correctional Education Association annual meetings, with their published proceedings, are perhaps the best single way to take the temperature of the correctional education discipline in America, and to hear about programs considered *model* at the time, for example, Education—A Weapon against Crime, 1981; National Forum, 1984.

60 See Profiles of Inmate Training Projects, 1971; Education for Tomorrow, 1976; Emmert, 1976; Holland 1978; *Catalog*, 1978 through 1989; *Education in Correctional Facilities*, 1981; Littlefield & Wolford, 1982; Peak, 1984; Occupational Training Programs Directory, 1990, a companion volume to the 1990 directory of postsecondary education programs at the federal level, mentioned above.

61 Reading Program Resource Manual, 1974, was the first guide for the prison educator through the labyrinth of available methodologies; Education Handbook, 1978, and Resource and Reference Guide, 1978, updated, Directory of Postsecondary Education Programs, 1981, handbooks for the federal system; New Hampshire State Prison, 1978, a handbook that reads like a college catalogue for student-inmates describing the various programs offered; Education Department Activation, 1985, and Simms et al., 1987, guides for correctional educators on implementation of effective post-secondary vocational programs; Boyles, 1987, a manual for volunteers in North Carolina. See especially two policy reviews, Reagen & Stoughton, 1976;

and Correctional Education Association, 1988, the published standards for correctional education programs as set forth by the CEA.

62 Teitelbaum, 1974; Lawrence, 1985. In an evaluation of jail education programs, the records from eight years of inmates enrolled in a county prison program revealed that students who were referred by other students made greater gains in reading and mathematics; progress was related to race, previous education, marital status, and gender (Rohm, 1989).

63 Coffey, O., Trends in the administration of correctional education, in Wolford et al., 1986, pp. 5-17.

64 *A Projection*, 1977. Home furlough and study-release programs demonstrate a low abscondence rate. Political factors obstruct the development of this approach (Smith, 1982; see also Habenstreit, 1973).

65 Boaz, 1976. Some of the evidence argues against the idea that education of inmates causes greater tractability. At Attica Correctional Facility in New York, no cause/effect relationship could be found to exist between *social programs* (ranging from family reunions and picnics to formal education, and including other variables such as age, ethnicity, sentence length) and a decrease in the frequency of misbehavior in terms of the number and types of infractions against prison rules. These programs were deemed to be ineffective as a means of social control or of reintegration (McCain & McNally, 1982). In this case, one would want to look carefully at the context of the study: the infamy of Attica, notorious for its ill treatment of inmates, especially of inmates of color, and the perceptions and expectations of the prison officials concerning their *social programs*. Education for the sake of manipulation easily backfires.

Family Reunion Program promoted tractability, and effected social control, of less-well-educated inmates much more than it did for inmate-students working at the post-secondary and continuing-education levels (Davis, 1988).

Basic education seems to be more immediately contributive to the tractability of inmates and their social control than does higher education. W. E. Reed, in a doctoral dissertation, demonstrated that inmates who enroll in college courses for self-improvement and to prepare themselves for better jobs after their release do not necessarily have fewer instances of disciplinary trouble than do non-collegian inmates. In one study, Blacks tended to enroll motivated primarily by their desire for self-improvement, whereas Whites were interested in job preparedness, but both derived self-esteem from their academic achievements. No cause/effect relation was found between *motivation for enrollment* and the variables of age, sex, previous education, semester hours completed, good-time classification, or number of disciplinary infractions (e.g., fighting, victimless offenses, conflicts with authority, and others). In fact, the evidence in this study suggested that the collegians may have become embroiled in more disciplinary infractions after enrolling than they had done before (Reed, 1982).

The heady feeling of being a college student may have led some of the inmates to feelings of superiority over the less-educated officers. This is an argument for staff training, not an argument against prison education.

66 Briggs, 1975; Black, 1975; Wheeler & Jones, 1977; Beckerman & Fontana, 1987. The report, *New Careers*, 1967, that inmate careers in mutual help does not always work well, was filed early in the experiment to allow inmates to take charge of their own social well-being.

153

67 St. Louis, 1974; Bachara & Zaba, 1978; Insight Incorporated, an inmate-administered, privately funded baccalaureate program in Minnesota, is exemplary for other post-secondary programs both in its cost-effectiveness and is democratic qualities (Proceedings, 1981).

68 Barnes et al., 1990, pp. 9-12: "Earned credit time" and an early release program predicated on tested and verified levels of achievement in four programs (education, literacy, substance abuse, and occupation), "tailored to an individual offender's needs and ability to progress throughout the period of imprisonment, with follow-up contact upon release to parole," would cost the State a little over $2 million in new staff costs to implement, but would save the State $9 million per year, for a savings, roughly, of $7 million per year "simply based on the number of adult inmates leaving the department" through early release. The committee used the figure $3,000 saved per year per inmate released early, and therefore probably conservatively underestimated the savings to the State, for it costs considerably more than that to keep an inmate for a year. In 1990, Indiana housed ca. 13,000 inmates, and its operating budget was ca. $216,000,000) (Camp & Camp, 1990, pp. 2, 36).

69 *Oversight Report*, 1988; for similar results, see Grieser, 1988; TIE, 1990; Burger, 1986. As long ago as 1976, the estimated potential productivity of the workforce in prisons and jails was $2.5 billion annually, whereas the annual productivity--due to slippage, an inadequately educated workforce, meaningless employment, outmoded equipment, and administrative ineptitude--was under $1 billion (Singer, 1976). Discussion of privatization of prison industries takes us somewhat afield, but is nevertheless related to our subject of literacy instruction because a more efficient workforce in or out of prison requires higher literacies.

T. J. Flanagan cautioned that privatization is not the panacea for all that ails prison industries, and he advised against thinking that even well-run prison industries can turn a profit, citing nonprofitable programs of academic and vocational education required to remediate inmates' deficiencies as workers. At the same time, he acknowledged that realistic criteria can be developed to determine the effectiveness of prison industry programs that would increase efficiency and the income potential of prison inmates (Flanagan, 1989).

70 Chicago, 1981; Kiser, 1987b; Smith, 1987; see Watts, 1990, for a bibliography on inmate legal self-help.

71 *The average criminal* in Britain has normal intelligence, a seventh-grade education, and below-average mechanical and/or technical aptitude. Therefore, prison education that begins with training in the manual disciplines typical of vocational education is not educating the individual in terms of preferred styles of learning or individual strengths and talents (Rahn, 1979).

It may be putting too fine a point on the argument, but inmates in a New York prison food-services program who became short-order cooks recidivated at a 26.6% rate (lower than the projected rate of 33.3%), whereas inmates who attained the less exalted position of being merely waiters or kitchen helpers recidivated at a rate of 37.2 (above the projected rate of 34.8%) (Macdonald & Bala, 1987).

72 MacCormick reported in his time that in Minnesota, a state librarian had oversight of all institutional libraries, and worked closely with inmate and professional librarians in prisons; and that in Wisconsin, the state library commission extended to inmates the same library privileges that other

citizens enjoyed, lending to each small institutional library books from the main collection, on demand (MacCormick, 1931, p. 156). It is more or less supposed to work this way now, in most places, but from personal experience and from various reports, we are aware that in many situations these services work better on paper and in policy than in reality.

73 MacCormick, 1931, chp. X, "The library as an agency of education," pp. 150-179; Appendix I, "Aids for the institution librarian," prepared by John Chancellor pp. 319-354; Appendix II, "Practical suggestions for the operation of institution libraries," prepared by Roland Mulhuaser, pp. 355-380. Bibliographies useful to prison librarians continue to be compiled; see Hartz et al., 1987, a select bibliography on the period from 1945 to 1985; Ryan, J. L., 1989, is an updated annotated bibliography of core resources pertinent to prison libraries for the development of literacy collections to meet the needs of adult or young adult new readers.

74 Teacher-presented instruction elicited higher scores than did the teaching machines, the results of which were, in turn, greater than the scores of those students who used text alone (Wood & Jenkins, 1971).

75Archambeault, 1987; see two major studies addressing the issues of technology in correctional education: Roberts & Coffey, 1976; Reagen and Stroughten, 1976.

76 Gehring, 1990; educators outside of prisons raise the same questions about a hi-tech approach to instruction (Askov & Turner, 1990).

77 Seashore, Haberfeld, Irwin, Baker, 1976, p. 90, said it did not; Clendenen et al., 1979, said it did.

78 See the Illinois State Advisory Council on Adult, Vocational and Technical Education and the Illinois Employment and Training Council (Illinois State, 1983); see also the Prison Education Task Force report to the Alabama State Board of Education (*Decisions* 1985, 1986); see also the proposal for an international comparison of corrections programs (Caruso, 1983).

79 See T. A. Ryan's survey of tests (Ryan et al., 1987) and Bell's typical survey and categorization of types of programs (Bell, R. et al., 1977).

80 T. A. Ryan et al., 1987 found that a total of 166 different tests were in use across the country. The most frequently used tests were the TABE (Test of Adult Basic Education) used in 58% of the institutions, the WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Test) used in 45%, and the General Aptitude Test Battery in 26%. The tests can be classified as tests of achievement (TABE, WRAT), criterion-referenced (CASAS: Ricard and Stiles, 1985), intelligence (Slosson, Stanford-Binet, WISC/WAIS), and psycho-educational functioning (Woodcock-Johnston) (Ryan et al., 1987). In addition to these formal instruments, the Literacy Volunteers of America use the Read Test, an informal reading inventory that measures sight-recognition of words, word-analysis skills, reading, and listening inventory (Hills & Karcz, 1990; see further, Bellorado et al.,1986; Lytle & Wolfe, 1989). The TABE has been demonstrated to be unreliable when predicting GED scores (Littlefield & Dowling, n/d), though it continues to be used (Stewart, 1990).

81 Basic literacy, general education, humanities and social-science courses were approved by the inmates, but programmed instruction, compulsory programs, and group-counseling sessions were deemed ineffective (Ayers, 1979). Less formal, but nonetheless *expert*, assessments of prison programs at Folsom in California, Lorton in the District of Columbia, Rahway in New Jersey, and Attica in New York were forthcoming in the early 1970s out of the

boiling pot of prison riots at those institutions. In the Folsom Manifesto and its equivalent from the Lorton Inmate Grievance Committee, strong observations were made about the need for improving vocational training, but almost complete silence prevailed concerning academic education. In both of those institutions, however, academic courses had been relatively better developed than had vocational training been. Among the *28 Points* issued at Attica, by contrast, was a demand for *education*, by which the inmates meant that they wanted the education system at Attica brought up to speed. *Point 5* issued at Rahway was more articulate:

> *Educational-Vocational: Rahway Prison is a place where the educational system is truly inadequate. The programs are irrelevant to the needs of the inmate. There is no vocational training at all. General Motors has tried in the past to put a plant in the prison so that inmates could at least learn a skill that would be beneficial to them upon release, but unfortunately they were turned away by people who deemed it unnecessary, because their way was the best way to rehabilitation. (cited in Reagen & Stoughton, 1976, pp. 100-101)*

82 Jenkins, 1989, p. 10; see Allemang, 1974, for a novel approach to control groups: In assessing a work/study program for delinquent women in 1974, each participant was taken to be her own *control,* as the researchers compared early data with completion data (Allemang, 1974). See also Bartell et al., 1977, for an attempt to arrange for control groups.

83 When educational programs are voluntary, attendance can be used as an indicator of program success (Harrison & Wood, 1977).

84 Evidence of a failed program with youthful offenders--usually relatively easy to work with--caused the researcher to call the policies and style of services in that particular program into question (Geizer, 1982a, b).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Some of the items in this list are incomplete, due primarily to incomplete secondary sources. Given the importance of at least partial citation, we have chosen to include some references in this less than ideal form.

(1984). 310 Project: Adult basic education learning center. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 317 787.

Abdul-Mu'Min, E. M. (1985). Prison power and survival. In R. M. Carter, D. Glaser, & L. T. Wilkins (Eds.), Correctional institutions (pp. 140-160). New York: Harper and Row.

Adams, S. (1974). Evaluative research in corrections—status and prospects. Paper, American Society of Criminology, 1973; Federal Probation, 38(1), 14-21.

Ahlstrom, W. M., & Havinghurst, R. J. (1971). *400 losers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Albert, M. (1989). Prison libraries: Rationale and role. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(3), 126-129.

Alessi, S. M. (1982-83). Effectiveness of a computer-based reading comprehension program for adults. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 11*(1), 43-57.

Alexander, J. F., & Parsons, B. V. (1973). Short-term behaviour intervention with delinquent families: Impact on family process and recidivism. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 81*(3), 219-225.

Alexander, W., & Caldwell, M. (1983). Characteristics of special needs learners.

Allemang, D. T. (1974). *Initial evaluation of the occupational preparation program—a work study program for institutionalized delinquent females* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 35/09A*, 5803.

Allen-Hagen, B. (1991). *Public juvenile facilities: Children in custody 1989.* Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Program Update on Statistics, entire issue.

Aller, C. C. (1968). Changing inmates through education. *Education and training in correctional institutions: Proceedings of a conference.* Madison, WI: Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education

Alper, B. S. (1987). Inside Nicaragua's prisons. *Crime and Social Justice,* (30), 78-87.

Alston, J. G. (1981). *Preparation for life after incarceration.* Presented at the annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior

Colleges, Washington, DC. Arlington, VA, ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 202559.

Alternative Programs for Troubled Youth. (1985). Hearing Before the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 101838.

American Correctional Association. (1979). *Comprehensive work entry program: Program manual and resource guide and units 2-7.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. No. NCJ 063911—NCJ 063916.

American Friends Service Committee. (1971). *Struggle for justice.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Amster, J. B., & Lazarus, P. J. (1984). Identifying learning problems in youthful offenders: Rationale and model. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 8*(4), 65-77.

Anderson, D. B. (1981). Relationship between correctional education and parole success. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation, 5*(3) 13-25.

Anderson, J. (1981). Adult education behind prison walls. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 5,* 20-21.

Angle, T. (1982). The development of educational programs in American adult prisons and juvenile reformatories during the nineteenth century. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(3), 4-7.

Angle, T., & Baldry, J. (1987). Dynamic custody at work: The PLATO computer-based education project at Millbrook Correctional Centre and the Ontario Correctional Institute. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(3), 120-124.

Arbuthnot, J. G., & Gordon, D. A. (1983). Moral reasoning development in correctional intervention. *Journal of Correctional Education, 34*(4), 133-138.

Archambeault, B. (1987). Computer-assisted instruction and criminal justice issues and applications. In J. Waldron (Ed.), *Microcomputers in criminal justice* (pp. 87-96). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Ariessohn, R. M., & Lott, N. B. (1990). Project AIM: A quiet battle in the war on drugs. *Corrections Today, 52*(3), 28, 30.

Arizona Department of Education. (1977). *Title 1 programs for educationally disadvantaged children and programs for neglected and delinquent children in State operated institutions: Annual report.* Phoenix, AZ: Author.

Ashcraft, J. L. (1979). *Orleans Parish (LA) prison rehabilitation: Final evaluation report.* Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice.

Askov, E. N., & Turner, T. C. (1990). The role of instructional technology in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(2), 82-85.

Atteberry, J. W., & Tacker, A. B. (1978). *Breaking out: Improving vocational education in correctional institutions: Final report*. Rockville, MD: National Insitute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 069900.

Austin, E. (1988). We will throw the book at them. *Prosecutor, 21*(4), 16-18.

Austin, J., & Krisberg, B. (1985). Incarceration in the United States: The extent and future of the problem. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 478*, 15-30.

Ayers, D. (1979). A model for prison education programs and guidelines for their operation. *Journal of Correctional Education, 30*(1), 3-8.

Ayers, D., Duguid, S., Montague, C., & Wolowidnyk, S. (1980). *Effects of University of Victoria Program: A post release study*. Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Ayers, J. D. (1981). Education in prisons: A developmental and cultural perspective. *Canadian Journal of Education, 6*(2).

Ayllon, T., Milan, M. A., Roberts, M. D., & McKee, J. M. (1979). *Correctional rehabilitation and management: A psychological approach*. Somerset, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Bachara, G. H., & Zaba, J. N. (1978). *Learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency*. Chicago, IL: Professional Press, Inc. (Reprinted from Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11[4], April, 1978) No. NCJ 050338.

Bal, A. S., & Mahon, J. (1978). *California Department of the Youth Authority compensatory education 1977-78: Program description and evaluation*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 062676.

Barkwell, L. J. (1976). Differential treatment of juveniles on probation: An evaluative study. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 18*(4), 363-378.

Barnes, H. E., & Teeters, N. (1959). *New horizons in criminology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barnes, M., et al. (1990). *A long-range plan for Indiana's criminal justice system: Final report to Governor Evan Bayh and Members, Indiana General Assembly*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.

Baron, R., Feeney, F., & Thornton, W. (1973). Preventing deliquency through diversion: The Sacramento County 601 Diversity Project. *Federal Probation*, 13-19.

Barry, C. (1988). Programmes for Koorie prisoners: Past, present, and future. In D. Biles (Ed.), *Current Australian trends in corrections*. Annandale, Australia: Federation Press.

Barry, J. (1958). *Alexander Maconochie of Norfolk Island: A study in pioneer prison reform*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Bartell, T., Brown, D. S., Doherty, W. J., Hemenway, J. A., Hoyt, J. L., Kwan, R. J., & Mantius, K. A. (1977). *Compensatory education and confined youth: A national evaluation of Title I programs in state institutions for neglected or delinquent youth*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 045219.

Bechtel, T. B. (1977). *Effects of a motivational treatment course on the self-concept and work value structures of trustee inmates of a maximum security prison*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38/12A*, 7292.

Beck, A. J., Kline, S. A., & Greenfeld, L. A. (1988). *Survey of youth in custody, 1987*. (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Beckerman, A., & Fontana, L. (1987). Value orientations of prison and non-prison social work students. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 11*(2), 21-32.

Beha, J. A. (1977). Innovation at the county house of correction and its effect upon patterns of recidivism. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14*(1), 88-106.

Bell, J. H. (1978). Institutional programs for treatment. In L. J. Hippchen (Ed.), *Handbook on correctional classification: programming for treatment and reintegration, 1978*. Cincinnati, OH: Laurel, MD: Anderson Publishing Company, American Correctional Association.

Bell, R., Conard, E., Gazze, B., Greenwood, S. C., Lutz, J. G., & Suppa, R. J. (1983). *The nature and prevalence of learning deficiencies among adult inmates*. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University.

Bell, R., Conard, E., Laffey, T., Lutz, J. G., Miller, P., Simon, C., & Stakelon, A. (1979). *National evaluation program, phase I report: Correctional education programs for inmates*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, No. NCJ 048174.

Bell, R., Conard, E., Laffey, T., Volz, C. C., & Wilson, N. J. (1977). *National evaluation program, phase one: Correctional education programs for inmates: The issues*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program.

Bell, R., Conard, E. H., & Suppa, R. J. (Dec 84). The findings and recommendations of the national study on learning deficiencies in adult inmates. *The Journal of Correctional Education, 35*, 129-37.

Bellorado, D., et al. (1986). *Making literacy programs work* (Vols. I-II). Washington DC: National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice.

Bennett, L. A., & Chatman, L. (1979). What works in adult corrections? New careers revisited. *Offender Rehabilitation, 3*(4), 325-339.

Bento, V. E. (1985). Impantando a politica do respeito aos direitos humanos dos presos no Departamento do Sistema Penitenciario (Desipe) do Rio de Janeiro. [Implanting in guards respect for the human rights of prisoners in the Rio de Janeiro penitentiary system]. *Arquivos Brasileiros de Psicologia, 37*(3), 84-96. (U Federal do Parana, Curitiba, Brazil)

Berckhauer, F., & Hasenpusch, B. (1982). Recidivism of released offenders: relationships between recidivism and correctional education measures. *Monatsschrift fuer Criminologie und Strafrechtsreform, 65*(6), 318-334. (Rueckfaelligheit entlassener Strafgefangener. Zusammenhaenge zwischen Rueckfall und Bildungsmassnahmen im Vollzug.)

Berleman, W. C., Seaberg, J. R., & Steinburn, T. W. (1972). The delinquency prevention experiment of the Seattle Atlantic Street Center: A final evaluation. *Social Service Review, 46*, 323-346.

Berry, G. W. (1971). Personality patterns and delinquency. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 41,* 221-223.

Bertholf, M. J. (1974). Feasibility study of post secondary education in a California prison. *Journal of Correctional Education, 26*(3), 18-24.

Besag, F., & Greene, J. B. (1985). Recipe for research: Intelligent Blacks plus inappropriate tests equals genetic inferiority. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(3), 110-115.

Bessette, J. M. (1989). *Correctional populations in the United States, 1986*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Beto, G. (1990). Corrections in the year 2012: Prospects for positive change. In A. Dargis (Ed.), *State of corrections: Proceedings of American Correctional Association Annual Conference* 1989. (pp. 4-7). Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.

Black, A. (1984). Role of education in prison and the Black inmate. In D. Georges-Abeyis (Ed.), *Criminal justice system and Blacks*. New York: Clark Boardman Company.

Black, L. R. (1975). Alternative education and corrections. Some new dimensions. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 107603.

Blackburn, F. S. (1981). Relationship between recidivism and participation in a community college Associate of Arts degree program for incarcerated offenders. Proceedings of the 36th annual Correctional Education Association conference (pp. 1-7). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 085126.

Bleick, C. R., & Abrams, A. I. (1987). The transcendental meditation program and criminal recidivism in California. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 15*, 211-230.

Blew, C. H., McGillis, D., & Bryant, G. (1977). Denver Project New Pride: Exemplary project. Washington, DC: Superintendent of Documents GPO. Cambridge MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Blumstein, A. (1983). Prisons, population, capacity, and alternatives. In J. Q. Wilson (Ed.), *Crime and public policy* (pp. 229-250). San Francisco: ISC Press.

Boaz, M. E. (1976). *An evaluative study of Project Outreach to inmates: A higher education program offered by the University of Virginia at three of Virginia's correctional institutions*--Draft. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 37/08A*, 4887. (NCJ No. 056277).

Bobal, C. M. (1984). Unconventional approaches to providing educational services to violent juvenile offenders. In R. A. Mathais, et al. (Eds.), Violent juvenile offenders: An anthology (pp. 273-281). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. No. NCJ 095174.

Bosma, A. (1987). Teaching inmates in small jails: Teacher reactions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(3), 114-118.

Boucouvalas, M., & Pearse, P. R. (1985). Educating the protective custody inmate for self-sirectness: An adult learning contract approach. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(3), 98-105.

Bovens, R. (1987). Alcohol program: An educational program for drunken drivers in prison. In M. J. M. Brand-Koolen (Ed.), *Studies on the Dutch prison system*. Berkeley, CA: Kugler Publications.

Boyle, H. (1978). *Follow-up evaluation of the effectiveness of a medium security state prison's vocational training program on parolees.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Boyles, A. (1987). DYS volunteer services manual. North Carolina Division of Youth Services.

Bozeman, W. C., & Hierstein, W. J. (1986). *Using the computer to improve basic skills.* Computer Assisted Basic Skills Project conducted by Southeastern Community College at the Iowa State Penitentiary.

Bradfield, R. H., Hilliard, A., Palmer, B., Jones, L., Wofford, J. & Gray, B. (1975). Project BEAM (Behavioral Evolvement Through Achievement Management): An experiment in intervention. *Journal of Negro Education, 44*, 34-41.

Braithwaite, J. (1980). Prisons, education and work: Towards a national employment strategy for prisons. Woden Act, Australia; Lawrence MA: Australian Institute of Criminology J. V. Barry Memorial Library; University of Queensland Press Order Department.

Brakel, J. S. (1982). Administrative justice in the penitentiary: A report on inmate grievance procedures. *American Bar Foundation Research Journal, 3*, 111-140.

Brasel, K. D. (1982). Heuristic self-discovery.group encounter in the prison college classroom. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(4), 21-14.

Braswell, M., Dillingham, S., & Montgomery, R. (1985). *Prison violence in America.* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

(1969). *Breakthrough for disadvantaged youth.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice. Author, No. NCJ 075406.

162

Breed, A. (1981). Charge. Proceedings of the U.S. Department of Education's Forum on Prisoner Education (pp 15-16). Publisher unknown.

Briggs, D. (1975). *De-clienting social work*. London, England: National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders.

Brizius, J. A., & Foster, S. E. (1987). *Enhancing adult literacy: A policy guide.* Washington, DC: Council of State Policy and Planning Agencies.

Broadbent, J. H. (1973). *Relationship between correctional education and training of inmates and their parole success.* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 34/05A,* 2468.

Brockway, Z. R. (1872). *Proceedings of First International Penitentiary Congress.* London: Publisher unknown.

Brodt, S. J., & Hewitt, J. D. (1984). Teaching "cons" about crime and justice: Experience with non-traditional students in a non-traditional setting. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(1), 15-17.

Brooks, T. M. (1980). Consumer education for the incarcerated: The state of the art. *Journal of Correctional Education, 31*(1), 4-7.

Brown, M. A. (1973). *Reading and bilingual laboratory guide*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 031224.

Bruce-McSwain, M. I. (1989). "SMUTS" is organic to prison inmates. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(3), 120-22.

Author unknown. (1985). Building partnerships for excellence in correctional education. A National Conference on Correctional Education. Arlington, VA: 1985.

Burger, W. E. (1985). Factories with fences: The prison-industries approach to correctional dilemmas. In I. P. Robbins (Ed.), *Prisoners and the law* (pp. 21-28). New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.

Burger, W. E. (1986). Factories with fences. In K. C. Haas & G. P. Alpert (Eds.), *Dilemmas of punishment* (pp. 349-356). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Burnham, T. (1985). A field test of a structured television curriculum on the mathematics achievement of incarcerated high school equivalency learners. Source unknown.

Burstow, B. (1989). Conscientization: A new direction for ex-inmate education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 8*(1), 25-45.

Burt, L. N. (1977). Information needs of inmates. *Library Trends, 26*(1), 27-38.

Burton, R. (1980). Channeling emotional response in the prison college classroom. In F. Cioffi (Ed.), *Unlocking shackled minds. A handbook for the college prison classroom.* Bloomington, IN: Poynter Center and Indiana University Foundation.

Byles, J. A., & Maurice, A. (1979). The Juvenile Services Project: An experiment in deliquency control. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 21*(2), 155-164.

(1971). *California—Department of the Youth Authority—Reading and Recidivism*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 028097.

(1975). *California—Evaluation of the Youth Conservation Camp Basic Employability Skills Program*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 028005.

Callahan, C. (1987). *Women in prison: Does the justice system do them justice?* Report on a leadership seminar sponsored by the Alaska Women's Commission, June 1986, Juneau, AK. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproductions Sales. No. NCJ 108982.

Camp, G. M., & Camp, C. G. (1990). *The corrections yearbook 1990: Adult prisons and jails.* South Salem, NY: Criminal Justice Insitute.

Campbell, W. R. (1978). *Dead man walking*. New York: Richard Marek.

Carroll, J. L. (1974). Bean picking and bars: Can prisons be compelled to rehabilitate? *Cumberland-Samford Law Review, 471.*

Carroll, L. (1982). Race, ethnicity, and the social order. In R. Johnson & H. Toch (Eds.), *The pains of imprisonment* (pp. 181-204). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Carroll, P. (1986). Bluewater Secondary School. *Guidance and Counselling, 1*(5), 50-55.

Carsetti, J. K., Heiss, W. E., & Pierce, C. (1979). Continuing to make a difference. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Microfiche Service, No. NCJ 064538.

Carter, D. (1986). Review of research applications: Kohlberg's theories in correctional settings. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(2), 79-83.

Caruso, J. M. (1983). A comparative paradigm for analyzing international community corrections programs. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 27*(2), 125-42.

Castro, A. L. (1977). Hispanic inmate: A new challenge for corrections in the 70s. In V. Fox (Ed.), *Twenty-second Southern Conference on Corrections annual proceedings*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 043422.

Castro, A. L. (1981). Bilingual programming: A viable alternative in corrections, part A. *Report from the national Hispanic Conference on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.*

(1982). *Catalog of Adult Education Projects, Fiscal Year 1982*. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 228379.

(1983). *Catalog of Adult Education Projects, Fiscal Year 1983*. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 235371.

(1984). *Catalog of Adult Education Projects, Fiscal Year 1984*. Seibles, M., comp. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 250496.

(1985). *Catalog of Adult Education Projects, Fiscal Year 1985*. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 251675.

(1986). *Catalog of Adult Education Projects, Fiscal Year 1986*. Parker, J., Ed. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 263375.

(1979). CDIS (Corrections Decision Information System) design requirements, documentation vocational education component program subsystem. California Department of Corrections, No. NCJ 069518.

Cei, L. B. (1983). Prison rehabilitation programs do work. *USA Today, 112*(2458), 55-57.

Chaka, R. R. (1980, October). *Dehabilitation versus rehabilitation: The contradictions of policy in maximum security prisons*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Illinois Sociological Association, Chicago, IL

Chamberlain, R. (1935). *There is no truce: A life of Thomas Mott Osborne*. New York: MacMillan.

Chandler, M. J. (1973). Egocentricism and anti-social behavior: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. *Developmental Psychology, 9*, 326-332.

Chaneles, S. (Ed.). (1985). Prisons and prisoners: Historical documents. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, & Rehabilitation, 10*(1-2).

(1976). *Changing times for the adult correctional educator*. Paper presented at the Correctional Educational Association International Conference, July 14, 1976, University of South Florida, Tampa. No. NCJ 048996.

Chapman, J. R. (1978). Employment preparation for female offenders: An overview. Paper presented at the American Correctional Association 108th Annual Congress of Correction. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 059753.

Chicago, Cook County, Criminal Justice Commission. (1981). *Evaluation of fourteen correctional service programs*. Chicago IL: Arthur Young and Company.

Chilton, R., & Simpson, J. E. (1972). Income, education, and delinquency: An empirical reexamination of the ecological fallacy. Paper presented at the 67th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Ciccone, J. K., & Friedenberg, J. E. (Eds). (1988). *Vocational special needs learners: Five years of research and development*.

Cioffi, F. (Ed.). (1980). *Unlocking shackled minds: A handbook for the college prison classroom.* Bloomington, IN: Poynter Center and Indiana University Foundation.

Clatworthy, F. J. (1982). Homer T. Lane's legacy of self-government: An inquiry into organizational synecology at the Boys Republic, 1909-1982.

Clemmer, D. (1958). *The prison community.* New York, NY: Rinehart & Co.

Clendenen, R. J., Ellingston, J. R., & Severson, R. J. (1979). Project Newgate.The first five years. *Crime and Delinquency, 25*(1), 55-64.

Coffey, O. D. (1982). American prison as an educational institution: Issues in correctional education for the 1980s. In L. Leiberg (Ed.), *Employment crime and policy issues* (pp. 111-134). Washington, DC: American University Washington College of Law.

Coffey, O. D. (1983). Meeting the needs of handicapped youth in correctional facilities. *Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education, 5*(3), 13-14, 24.

Coffey, O. D., & Carter, D. (1986). Improving corrections education: Two perspectives for vocational ed. Occasional Paper No. 111.

Coffey, O. D., Procopiow, N., & Miller, N. (1989). *Programming for mentally retarded and learning disabled inmates: A guide for correctional administrators.* Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 306364.

Cogburn, H. E. (1988). *Recidivism study: Postive terminations for J. F. Ingram State Technical College, 1976-86.* Deatsville, AL: J. Ingram State Technical College.

Cohen, S., & Taylor, L. (1972). *Psychological survival: The experience of long-term imprisonment.* New York: Pantheon.

Collins, M. (1988a). Prison education: A substantial metaphor for adult education practice. *Adult Education Quarterly, 38*(2), 101-10.

Collins, M. (1988b, March). Towards a distinctive vocation for prison educators: Some key concerns and relevant strategies. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(1), 24-28.

Collins, M. (1990). Educational television in a Canadian high maximum security unit. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(2), 46-49.

Author unknown. (1972-1973). Comment: The convict's voice—The fourteenth amendment and the new right to establish rights. *Iowa Law Review, 58,* 1323-1339. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa, College of Law.

Conine, A. D., & Maclachlan, M. B. (1982). Special learning unit for developmentally disabled offenders. In M. B. Watson (Ed.), *Retarded Offenders* (pp. 450-463). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Conner, R. F., Davidson, W., & Emshoff, J. (1978). *Legal aid and legal education for prisoners: An evaluation of the State Bar of Michigan's Prison Project.* Washington, DC: American Bar Association Basics.

Conrad, J. P. (1965). *Crime and its corrections: An international survey of attitudes and practices.*

Conrad, J. P., & Cavros, J. (1981). *Adult offender education programs.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. 75650

Correctional Education Association. (1988). *Standards for adult and juvenile correctional education programs.* College Park, MD: Author.

Correctional Education Association. (1989). *Learning behind bars: Selected educational programs from juvenile, jail, and prison facilities.* Laurel, MD: Author

Cosman, J. W. (1980). Penitentiary education in Canada. *Education Canada, 20*(1), 42-47.

Council of Chief State School Officers, E. R. Center on Educational Equity (1990). A concern about adult literacy. (Forum on Corrections Research, vol 3, no 1, 1991)

Cox, G. B., Carmichael, S. J., & Dightman, C. (1977). An evaluation of a community based diagnostic program for juvenile offenders. *Juvenile Justice, 28*(3), 33-41.

Coyle, W. J. (1987). *Libraries in prisons: A blending of institutions.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Author unknown. (1975). Criminal law, Emerging rights of prisoners: Right to refuse rehabilitation. *Tennessee Law Review, 42*(4), 793-803.

Cross-Drew, C. (1984). Project Jericho evaluation report, final report: 1984. Source unknown.

Author unknown. (1984). *CUNY Tech continuing education annual report, 1983-1984.* Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 251143.

Author unknown. (1983). Current trends in correctional education theory and practice. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 7*(3/4).

Curry, W. J. (1974). *Academic and motivational characteristics of prison inmates enrolled in the community college program at North Carolina's correctional institutions. An exploratory study.* (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 35/12A,* 7593.

Cusick, T., & Wolfe, L. R. (1985). *Fulfilling the promise: A guide to the sex equity provisions of the Vocational Educational Act.* PEER Policy Paper.

Dalglish, C. (1979). Basic education for offender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 23*(3), 240-243.

Dalglish, C. (1983). Illiteracy and the offender. *Adult Education*. London, *56*(1), 23-6.

Daniel, D. A. (1984). Effects of extensive group therapy on incarcerated young men's attitudes toward themselves and prison staff. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 8*(4), 27-39.

Davidson, J. (1989). Adolescent illiteracy: Developing successful programs to solve the problem. *New Designs for Youth Development, 8*, 56-57.

Davidson, W. S., & Robinson, M. J. (1975). Community psychology and behavior modification: A community based program for the prevention of delinquency. *Corrective Psychiatry and Social Psychiatry, 21*, 1-12.

Davidson, W. S., & Wolfred, T. R. (1977). Evaluation of a community based behavior modification program for prevention of delinquency: The failure of success. *Community Mental Health Journal, 13*(4).

Davies, L. (1981). Adult learning: A lived experience approach to understanding the process. *Adult Education, 31*, 227-234.

Davis, J. C., & Dickens, B. (1986). Supplemental services for special needs students in vocational education programs: Guidelines for implementation under the provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (P. L. 98-524).

Davis, R. (1988). Education and the impact of the family reunion program in a maximum security prison. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 12*(2), 153-59.

Davis, S., & Chown, B. (1986). *Recidivism among offenders incarcerated by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections who received vocational-technical training: A survival data analysis of offenders released January 1982-July 1986*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 108000.

Day, S. (1979). *Education and training in the criminal justice system: Implications for vocational education R and D (Research and Development)*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, National Center for Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 179721).

(1990). *D.C. Government: Noneducation Factors Hindered Criminal Justice Initiative*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 126083.

DeLong, C. F. (1978). *Changes in prisoner perceptions of control over life situations as a result of learning decision-making skills*. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/04A*, 2139.

Deboe, R. C. (1982). Andragogy locked up: The enigma of adult education in corrections.

(1986). Decisions 1985, directions 1984: Progress report. Alabama State Board of Education.

Decker, J. M. (1980). Inside prison walls. *Community College Frontiers, 9*, 26-35.

Deloria, J. V. (1974). *Indian Education Confronts the Seventies, Vol 5.Future Concerns, 1974.* Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113092.

Dell'Apa, F. (1973). *Educational programs in adult correctional institutions: A survey.* Boulder, Co: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 550).

Dennison, J. (1979). *Penitentiary education in Canada: The role for community colleges.* Vancouver, British Columbia: University of British Columbia, Department of Education.

Department of Correctional Training Resource Center. (1990). *Correctional training, industries and education.* Richmond, KY: Eastern Kentucky University.

Deppe, D. A. (1982). New model for correctional education. In L. J. Hippchen (Ed.), *Holistic approaches to offender rehabilitation* (pp. 256-266). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Devlin, R. J., et al. (1984). The adult special education student in a state correctional system: A profile. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(2), 47-49.

Diem, R. A., & Fairweather P. G. (1979, April). *Evaluation of the effectiveness of a computer-assisted instructional program in basic literacy skills in a county jail.* Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175423.

Diem, R. A., & Knoll, J. F. (1981). Technology and humanism: New approaches in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(1), 4-6.

Diem, R. A., & Knoll, J. F. (1982). An analysis of an alternative model of an inmate educational system. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 6*(4), 83-93.

Dierkroger, D. (1987). Career counseling in prison. *Journal of Offender Counseling, 7*(2), 34-39.

Dillingham, S. D. (1991). *Correctional populations in the United States, 1988.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Dilulio, J. J. (1987). *Governing prisons.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Dinges, R. F. (1975). *Effectiveness of a tutor-student method of teaching reading to functionally illiterate inmates at the Illinois State Penitentiary.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 027486.

Directory of postsecondary education programs, 1981 edition (1981). Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 081575.

Directory of postsecondary education programs, 1990. (1990). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Dobbs, R. (1984). Correctional education: Methods and practices in the computer age.

Dollar, E. M. (1988). Keeping them from coming back to prison in Oklahoma. *Vocational Education Journal, 63*(1), 29-30.

Dominguez, B., Rueda, M., Makhlouf, C., & Rivera, A. (1976). Analysis and control of activities in custodial human groups. In E. Ribes-Inesta & A. Bandura (Eds.), *Analysis of delinquency and aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Downing, D. M., Stitt, T. R., & Murray, M. C. (1987). Career readiness programs for correctional institutions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(1), 22-24.

Duenkel, F., & Johnson, E. H. (1980). Introduction of therapy into Tegel Prison: Evaluation of an experiment. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 4*(2), 233-47.

Dufour, M. M. (1989). Retention rate for inmates in higher education programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(1), 28-33.

Duguid, S. (1981a). Moral development, justice and democracy in the prison. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*.

Duguid, S. (1981b). *On prison education*. (Catalogue No. JS8L-14/1982E). Ottawa, Canada: Government Publishing Centre (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 685).

Duguid, S. (1982). Rehabilitation through education: A Canadian model. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 6*(1), 53-67.

Duguid, S. (1983). Origins and development of university education at Matsqui Institution. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 25*(3), 295-308.

Duguid, S. (1986b). *Readings in critical thought and cultural literacy: A humanities core curriculum linking knowledge, understanding, judgement and choice.* Burnaby, BC, Canada: Simon Fraser University.

Duguid, S. (1986a). Selective ethics and integrity: Moral development and prison education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(2), 60-64.

Duguid, S. (1987a). Democratic praxis and prison education. *Howard Journal, 26*(1), 57-65.

Duguid, S. (1987b). Prison education: A case for the liberal arts. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(3), 108-112.

Duguid, S. (1988). "To inform their discretion" prison education and empowerment. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(4), 174-181.

Dwiggins, D., et al. (1986). Overview of PL 94-142 and IEPs. Teacher Training Module #4. Correctional/Special Education Training Project.

Dwyer, P., & Botein, M. (1974). The right to rehabilitation for prisoners: Judicial reform of the correctional process. *New York Law Forum, 20*, 273-311

Earnest, E. E., Libb, J. W., Davis, J. C., Kennedy, M., & Waldrop, P. (1975). Juvenile rehabilitation program of the Ridgecrest Children's Center, A preliminary report. *Proceedings of the American Correctional Association's 104th Annual Congress of Corrections*, Houston, TX. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.

(1991). Education and recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research, 3*(1), 3-7.

Crime bill amendment would mandate literacy programs in jails. (1991, July 8). *Education Daily*, p. 3.

GED grads outperform high school grads on literacy test. (1991, July 8). *Education Daily*, p. 3.

Senate bill would only encourage prison literacy programs. (1991, July 8). *Education Daily*, p. 2.

(1985). *Education department activation*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 100946.

(1976). *Education for tomorrow: Federal prison system*.Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

(1978). *Education handbook. A resource and reference guide for education and leisure activity managers and personnel in the federal prison system*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. No. NCJ 050988.

(1981). Education in correctional facilities. *Criminal Justice Monitor, 4*(1).

(1990). *Education in prison*. Croton, NY: Manhattan Publishing Company. (Recommendation No. R[89] 12 adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe).

(1981). Education: A weapon against crime. *A Forum on Prisoner Education, Summary Proceedings*. Arlington, VA: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208218.

(1973). *Educational needs study from inmates of Vermont correctional institutions*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 019496

(1982). *Educational services for jailed youth*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 088489.

Egan, G. (1982). *The skilled helper: model, skills, and methods for effective helping* (2nd Ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Eggleston, C., & Gehring, T. (1986). Correctional education paradigms in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(2), 86-92.

Eller, B. F. (1979). Analysis of the effect of tutorial contracting on the academic grades and truancy rates of delinquent and low-achieving students. *Offender Rehabilitation, 3*(3), 229-243.

Ellis, D. (1979). The prison guard as Carceral Luddite: A critical review of the MacGuigan Report on the Penitentiary. *Canadian Journal of Sociology, 4,* 43-64.

Ellis, G. A. (1979). *Inside Folsom Prison.* Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

Emmert, E. B. (1976). *Offender assistance programs operated by postsecondary institutions of education.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Empey, L. T., & Lubeck, S. G. (1971). *The Silverlake experiment: Testing delinquency theory and community intervention.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publications.

(1980). Employment research project, part one: Unemployment, crime and vocational counseling. Part two: Case studies and codebook. *Prison Journal, 60*(1, 2), entire issue.

Englander, F. (1983, July). Helping ex-offenders enter the labor market. *Monthly Labor Review, 106*(7), 25-30.

Enocksson, E. (1980). Correctional programs. A review of the value of education and training in penal institutions. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 5*(1), 5-18.

Erlewine, C., & Cavior, H. (1989, Fall). Inmates and computers: Managing access, preventing abuse. *Federal Prisons Journal, 1*(2), 28-31.

Evans, K. W. (1978). *Reflections on education in the penitentiary.* In William Taylor & Michael Breswell (Eds.), *Police and Criminal Psychology.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Everington, C., & Luckasson, R. (1989, September). Addressing the needs of the criminal defendant with mental retardation: The special educator as a resource to the criminal justice system. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24*(3), 193-200.

Ewing, M. D. (1985, December). Private industry opportunity. *Corrections Today,* pp. 92, 94.

Fabiano, E. (1991, June). How education can be correctional and how corrections can be educational. *Journal of Correctional Education, 42*(2), 100-106.

Fagan, W. T. (1989, December). Prisoners' and non-institutional adults' perceptions of conditions affecting their learning. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(4), 152-58.

Farr, Roger, & Carey, R. (1986). *Reading: What can be measured?* (2nd ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Farrar, J. R. (1986). Achieving prisoners' right of access to court. Houston, TX: Sam Houston State University.

Farrar, M. T. (1986). Four concepts of literacy. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 7*, 43-55.

Farrow, J. A., & Schroeder, E. (1984). Sexuality education groups in juvenile detention. *Adolescence, 19*(76), 817-826.

Federal Bureau of Prisons. (1990). Occupational Training Programs Directory. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

(1991). Federal Register. Control, custody, care, treatment and instruction of inmates; *Literacy Program (GED Standard).56*(84), 20088-20089

Filipczak, J., Friedman, R. M., & Reese, S. C. (1979). PREP (Preparation through responsive educational programs): Educational programming to prevent juvenile problems. J. S. Stumphauzer (Ed.), *Progress in behavior therapy with delinquents.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Fize, M. (1982, January-March). History of vocational training in corrections since 1945. *Revue Internationale de Criminologie et de Police Technique, 35*(1), p. 33-46.

Fize, M. (1981, July-September). Occupational training in the correctional setting and recidivism among youths leaving prison. *Revue de science criminelle et de droit penal compare*, (3), p. 653-664.

Fizzell, R. L. (1983). Meeting different learning styles in the correctional education setting. In H. E. Pecht (Ed.), *Correctional education—A focus on success.*

Flanagan, T. J. (1982, January). Correctional policy and the long-term prisoner. *Crime and Delinquency, 28*(1), 82-95.

Flanagan, T. J. (1989). Prison labor and industry. In L. M. Doris & Layton Goodstein (Eds.), *American prison: Issues in research and policy.* (pp. 135-161). New York: Plenum Press.

(1976). *Florida youth services program office—Annual evaluation report of educational programs.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services Office of Children, Youth, and Families, Data Analysis Unit.

(1977). *Florida youth services program office—Annual evaluation report of educational programs.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services Office of Children, Youth, and Families, Data Analysis Unit.

Foley-Jones, C. R., & Broadhurst, R. G. (1977). *Prisoner work and educational preferences.* Western Australia Department of Corrections, Research and Information Series (17).

Foster, E. (1975). *Female offenders in the federal correctional system.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 015336.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Fox, T. A. (1987, May). *Teaching in prisons: Consideration of the concept of adult education.* Paper presented at the Conference on Change: Implications for Adult Learning. (Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada).

Fox, T. A. (1989, March). The necessity of moral education in prisons. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(1), 20-25.

Freasier, A. W. 1990, (June). Correctional education association survey: The use of technology in the education process. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(2), 74-77.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

French, L. (1981). Native American correctional treatment. In L. Sloan (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in corrections.* (pp. 63-77). Jonesboro TN: Pilgrimage Press.

Gagne, E. E. (1977). Educating delinquents: A review of research. *Journal of Special Education, 11*, 13-27.

Gaither, C. C. (1982, June). Education behind bars: An overview. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(2), 19-23.

Galley, J. P., & Parsons, M. H. (1976). *College behind the walls. Factors influencing a post-secondary inmate education program.* Kansas City, MO. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130696. (Paper presented at the Community College Social Science Association 1976 National Convention).

Garfunkel, F. (1986, December). The conditions of correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(4), 157-60.

Garrett, C. J. (1985). Effects of residential treatment on adjudicated delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 22*, 287-308.

Garrett, C. J. (1984). *Efficacy of treatment for adjudicated delinquents: Meta-analysis.* Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH.

Garrison, R. W. (Ed). (1987). *Alternative schools for disruptive youth.* NSSC Resource Paper.

Gehring, T. (1988b, December). Five principles of correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(4), 164-169.

Gehring, T. (1990, December). Results of a nationwide survey: Correctional education organizational structure trends. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(4), 174-81.

Gehring, T. (1989, December). A change in our way of thinking. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(4), 166-73.

Gehring, T. (1988a, June). The connection between democracy and cognitive processes in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(2), 62-69.

Gehring, T. M., Muth, W. R. (1985, December). The correctional education/prison reform link: Part I, 1840-1900. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(4), 140-46.

Gehring, T., & Clark, R. (1979). *A proposal from the rehabilitative school authority for correctional education teacher certification and teacher training program(s).* Richmond, VA: unpublished paper.

Geizer, B. P. (Ed.). (1982a). *Impact of youth rehabilitation programs.* Research Report.

Geizer, B. P. (Ed.). (1982b). *Management of youth rehabilitation programs.* Program Audit. (New York State Division for Youth).

Gelber, S. (1988). Developing an AIDS program in a juvenile detention center. *Children Today, 17*(1), 6-9.

Gendreau, P. & Ross, R. R. (1983). Success in corrections: Programs and principles. In R. R. Corrado (Ed.), *Juvenile justice.* Toronto, OT: Butterworths.

(1972). Genesee County, Michigan, *Rehabilitative day care program for juvenile and youth offenders.* Final Report. Flint, MI: Genesee County Children's Facility.

Gentry, L., & Escoe, A. (1983, February 28). *Training and employment prerequisites survey.* Nevada Correctional Centers for Youth.Southwest Regional Laboratory Technical Note. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

George, P. S., Ramsey, C., & Krist, G. (1980). The college program in the Georgia state prison. *Community College Frontiers, 8*(2), 21-25.

George, W. (1911). *The junior republic: Its history and ideals.* New York: D. Appleton.

(1976). *Georgia prisons.* Report prepared by the Georgia Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 069997.

Gerry, M. H. (1986). *Monitoring the special education program of correctional institutions: A guide for special education monitoring staff of state education agencies.*

Gilpin, M. O. (1982). *PLATO at Graham Correctional Center: Starting an Innovative Classroom.* Hillsboro, IL: PLATO Corrections Project at Graham Correctional Center.

Glaser, D. (1964). *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system.* Indianapolis IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Gleason, S. E. (1978). *Impact of prison vocational training on recidivism.*

Gleason, S. E. (1986, Summer). Inmate attitudes toward vocational training. A case study of vocational training students in the state prison of southern Michigan. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 10*(4), 49-60.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums.* Garden City: Anchor.

Gold, M. (1978). Scholastic experiences, self-esteem, and delinquent behavior. *School Crime and Disruption: Prevention Models.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Gold, P. (1983). *Literacy training in penal institutions.* Proceedings of the National Adult Literacy Conference. (pp. 126-139). Washington, DC.

Goldin, C. (1982). *Organizing humanities programs for prisoners: A guide for planning and delivery.* College of Continuing Education, Northern Illinois University.

Goldin, C., & Bean, S. (1983). Schools and prison: Teaching in a total institution. *Teaching Newsletter, American Sociological Association, 8,* 9-10.

Goldin, C., & Thomas, J. (1984, Spring). Adult education in correctional settings: Symbol or substance? *Adult Education Quarterly, 34*(3), 123-34.

Goodman, Y., & Burke, C. (1972). *The reading miscue inventory.* New York: MacMillan.

Gormly, J., & Nittoli, M. J. (1974, Spring). Psychological approach to reading. *Journal of Correctional Education, 26*(2), 18-21.

Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy. (1988). *Arkansas action plan for literacy enhancement: Report of the Governor's Commission on Adult Literacy*

Gowen, R. P. (Ed.). (1984). Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile Repeat Offenders. College Park, MD.

Grande, C. G. (1987, September). General education development predictions: An administrative tool for planning correctional education for male youthful offenders. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(3), 124-28.

Grande, C. G., & Koorland, M. A. (1988). A complex issue: Special education in corrections. *Children and Youth Services Review, 10*(4), 345-50.

Grattan, C. H. (1959). *American ideas about adult education, 1710-1951.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Greenfeld, L. A. (1990, May). *Prisoners in 1989.* Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, entire issue.

Greenwood, P. W. (1988). *Correctional program for chronic juvenile offenders: Characteristics of three exemplary programs.* Eric Document Reproduction Service, ED 301784.

Greenwood, P. W. (1985). *The juvenile rehabilitation reader.*

Greenwood, P. W., & Zimring, F. E. (1985). *One more chance: The pursuit of promising intervention strategies for chronic juvenile offenders.*

Grenier, C. E., & Roundtree George A. (1987, Fall-Winter). Predicting recidivism among adjudicated delinquents: A model to identify high risk offenders. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 12*(1), 101-12.

Gribben, B. (1983). Prison education in Michigan City. *Phi Delta Kappa, 64*(9), 656-658.

Grieser, R. C. (Aug 1988). Model approaches: Examining prison industry that works. *Corrections Today, 50*, 5.

Griggs, S. A. (1975). *Program for adolescents (male and female) in corrective institutions—Rikers Island.* Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 138681.

Grissom, R. J. (1977). *An analysis of a curriculum supplement especially designed for Tucker Prison inmates, Arkansas Department of Correction.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/01A*, 89.

Groeneveld, T., & Gerrard, B. A. (1985, January). Short-term human relations training for corrections personnel. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 27*(1), 97-101.

Habenstreit, B. (1973). *To my brother who did a crime... Former prisoners tell their stories in their own words.* New York: Doubleday.

Haber, G. M. (1983, Spring/Summer). Realization of potential by Lorton, DC inmates with UDC (University of the District of Columbia) College Education Compared to Those Without UDC Education. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation, 7*(3,4), 37-55.

Haberman, M., & Quinn, L. M. (1986, September). The high school re-entry myth: A follow-up study of juveniles released from two correctional high schools in Wisconsin. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(3), 114-17.

Hackett, B. (1988). *Correctional education: A way to stay out.* Springfield, IL: Illinois Council on Vocational Education.

Hagerstown (Maryland) Junior College (1982). Hagerstown Junior College Prison Program Operations Manual. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215745.

Hairston, C. F., & Lockett, P. W. (1987). Parents in prison: New directions for social services. *Social Work, 32(2)*, 162-164.

Halasz, I. M. (1982, December). Evaluating vocational education programs in correctional institutions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(4), 7-10.

Hall, S. (1986). The Education Consolidation Improvement Act (ECIA) Chapter I Computer Lab. (Sumter Correctional Institution, Florida)

Hamilton, L. S. (1985). Campesinos and the undocumented inmate: Comparisons and the impact of prison. *Migration Today, 13*(3), 19-29.

Hamm, M. S. (1987b). The human potential seminar. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*, 4-7.

Hamm, M. S. (1988, December). Making changes in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(4), 146-52.

Handler, E. (1975). Residential treatment programs for juvenile delinquents. *Social Work, 20*, 217-222.

Hard, C. E. (1976). *Operational Study on Prison Education with Emphasis on the Federal Correctional Institution, Terminal Island, California*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California State University.

Harper, G. W. (1988, March). Mental ability and academic achievement of male juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(1), 18-22.

Harrison, H. D., & Wood, R. W. (1977, February). *Evaluation of a correctional education treatment program. Variables affecting inmate behavior.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 053994. Presented at the National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation, Washington, DC.

Hart, K. (1987). *Education programs in prisons*. Juneau, AK: Alaska State Legislature House Research Agency.

Hartz, F. R., Krimmel, M. B., & Hartz, E. K. (1987). *Prison librarianship. A selective, annotated, classified bibliography, 1945-84*. Jefferson NC: McFarland Company, Inc.

Hassell, L. W. (1988, January-February). Keeping them from coming back to prison in Arkansas. *Vocational Education Journal, 63*(1), 28-29, 77.

Hawkins, J. D., & Wall, J. S. (1980). *Alternative education. Exploring the delinquency prevention potential.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 066332. Report of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers.

Heath, R. L. (1977). La Puente, Colorado, School Program Final Report, November 1, 1974-June 30, 1976. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 045972.

Hedin, R. (1980). Teaching literature in prisons. In F. Cioffi (Ed.), *Unlocking shackled minds: A handbook for the college prison classroom*. (pp. 18-23). Bloomington, IN: Poynter Center and Indiana University Foundation.

Helgeson, M. E., & Hisama, T. (1982, December). Teaching basic reading skills to incarcerated non-readers. The brick wall analogy and a multi-modality approach. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(4), 25-28.

Henderson, J. H., & Hardison, N. (1983). Demise of rehabilitation—Its effect on local detention facilities. A case study of San Diego County. In H. E. Pecht (Ed.), *Correctional education: A focus on success.*

Herbst, D. P., & Sontheimer, H. G. (1987, Spring-Summer). Synergistic model for a juvenile court administered alternative education program. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 11*(2), 67-77.

Hernandez, P. (1978). *Bilingual curriculum for adult education.* Albany, NY: New York State Department of Correctional Services.

Herrick, E. (1991): personal communication.

Herron, R. H., Muir, J. T., & Williams, D.(1973). *National survey of postsecondary education programs for incarcerated offenders.* Hackensack, NJ: National Council on Crime.

Herschler, E. (1976, Spring). Education: Weapon against crime. *Compact, 10*(2), 4-6.

Hills, A., & Karcz, S. (1990, May). Literacy survey. ASFDCE National Agenda: The Association of State and Federal Directors of Correctional Education and the National Correctional Education Consortium, Inc., Newsletter, special edition.

Hipchen, L. J. (1982). *Holistic approaches for offender rehabilitation.* Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

(1986). Hispanic Inmate Needs Task Force Final Report. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. No. NCJ 106757.

Holder, S. C. (1988, June). A dialectical approach to moral issues in the prison English classroom. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(2), 86-88.

Holder, T. (Fall 1978). Review and perspective of human resource development (HRD) programs in corrections. *Criminal Justice Review, 3*(2), 7-17.

Holland, J. L. (1978). *College degrees through independent study. An alternative approach.* Alexandria VA: Centaur Publications.

Horan, C., Mauzy, B. W., & Spain, R. E. (1975). *Establishing an education program at the Marin County, California, jail.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113548.

Horvath, G. J. (1982, September). Issues in correctional education: A conundrum of conflict. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(3), 8-15.

Housewright, V., & Fogel, D. (1977). Problems of corrections—Rehabilitation. Law and Crime, 1977. Chicago IL: Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation.

Hruska, T. J. (1981). *Morality and the study of literature in the prison classroom.* Proceedings of the 36th Annual Correctional Education Association Conference. (pp. 56-64). Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 085125 & 085132.

Hudson, J. B. (1971). *Evaluation of MDTA training in correctional institutions,* V 1: Perspectives on offender rehabilitation. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration. ((Labor Department # 43-9-008-23)

(1991, May 22-25). ICOPA V. Preliminary Program for the 5th International Conference on Penal Abolition. Unpublished program, Indiana University Department of Criminal Justice.

Illinois State Advisory Council. (1983). Corrections Education Public Hearings. Special Report. Springfield IL.

Imel, S. (1986). *Correctional education: Selected aspects.* Overview. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275888.

Imel, S. (1990). *Vocational education in corrections. Trends and issues alerts.* Bloomington IN: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 317847.

Ingalls, J. D. (1973). *A trainer's guide to androgogy.* Waltham: Data Education, Inc.

Ingram, J. C. (May 1985). Recidivism, perceived problem-solving abilities, MMPI characteristics, and violence: A study of black and white incarcerated male adult offenders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 41*(3), 425-32.

(1980). *Inside/Out.* Vancouver, B.C., Canada: Centaur Productions, Inc.

Inwald, R. E. (1982). Research problems in assessing stress factors in correctional institutions. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 26*(3), 250-54.

Irwin, J. (1980). *Prisons in turmoil.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Izzo, M. V., & Drier, H. N. (1987). *Career guidance within JTPA for high risk populations: programs, methods, and products.* ERIC Document, ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 278869.

Izzo, R., & Ross, R. R. (1989). *Meta-analysis of rehabilitation programs for juvenile delinquents.* Criminal Justice and Behavior.

Jacobs, A., & Adams, S. (1971). *District of Columbia—Educational program of the D.C. jail. Analysis and recommendations.* Washington DC: District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

Jacobs, J. B., & Kraft, L. J. (1978). Integrating the gatekeepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. *Social Problems, 25,* 304-318.

Jacobs, J. B., & Kraft, L. J. (1983). Race relations and the guards' subculture. In J. B. Jacobs, (Ed.), *New perspectives on prisons and imprisonment.* (pp. 160-

177). Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press. Reprinted and revised from *Social Problems, 25*(3) 304-318, February 1978.

Jacobs, W. J., & Dana, A. H. (1975). *Community college inmate student assessment*. Personality and educational activity project report. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 112988.

Jacquette, P. (1982, October-December). Changement dans les prisons. Quel changement? A quel prix? *Revue penitentiaire et de droit penal, 106*(4), 395-404.

(1972, November). Jail inmate rehabilitation program. *American County, 37*(10), 11-12.

Janosik, S. M. (1985, September). Characteristics of repeat student offenders: A 6-year study. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*(5), 410-14.

Jeffery, I. A. (1968). *Behavioral experimentation in the control of academic and criminal behaviors of ghetto youths.*

Jengeleski, J. L. (1984, September). Reintegrating the ex-offender: A critique of education and employment programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(3), 90-95.

Jenkins, D. (1989). *Evaluation of correctional education programs.* MD: U.S. Department of Corrections, p. 10.

Jennings, W. (1983). Effects of just community programs on the moral level and institutional perceptions of youthful offenders. In L. Morin (Ed.), *On prison education*. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Governmental Publications Centre Supply and Services, 293-215.

Jensen, D. N. (1984). *Purse, sword and judgment: The impact of court intervention on social policy.*

Johnson, F. A., & Baca, A. R. (1985). *A handbook for establishing adult education programs in county jails of Texas.*

Johnson, J. L. (1979, April). Essay on incarcerated youth. An oppressed group. *Exceptional Children, 45*(7), 566-571.

Johnson, R. (1987). *Hard time.* Monterey CA: Brooks/Cole.

Johnson, R. A. (1978). *Perceived educational goals and needs among three select groups at the maximum security prison in Lucasville, Ohio.* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38/12A,* 7054.

Jones, J. S. (1977). *Vocational education in corrections. An interpretation of current problems and issues.* Columbus OH: National Center Publications.

Jones, K. A. (1988). *Dynamics and diversity: Exploring implications for accountability in crime, drugs, public and social policy.*

Jurik, N. C., Halemba, G. J., & Musheno, M. C. (1987, February). Educational attainment, job satisfaction, and the professionalization of correctional officers. *Work and Occupations, 14*(1), 106-125.

(1990, October 22). Justice to force prisoners to reach 12th-grade reading level. *Education Daily*, p. 6.

Kandel, H. J., & Ayllon, T. (1976). Rapid educational rehabilitation for prison inmates. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 14*(5), 323-331.

Kandel, T. B. (1981, January/February). Behind closed doors: Teaching sociology in prison. *Social Policy*, pp. 52-54.

Kangisser, D. (1985). *Pioneers and new frontiers. The role of volunteers in combating adult illiteracy*. New York Business Council for Effective Literacy.

Kassebaum, G., Ward, D., & Wilner, D. (1971). *Prison treatment and parole survival: An empirical assessment*. Toronto, OT: John Wiley and Sons.

Karcz, S. A. (1985). *The impact of a special education related service on selected behaviors of detained handicapped youth.*

Kazar, D. B. (1987). *The treatment of the mentally retarded offender in the State of North Carolina.*

Keilitz, I., & Dunivant, N. (1986, May-June). The relationship between learning disability and juvenile delinquency current state of knowledge. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(3), 18-26.

Kelley, M. C. (1978). *Education within the detention facility*. Reno NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

Kelley, T. M., Kiyak, A., & Blak, R. A. (1979). The effectiveness of college student comparison therapists with predelinquent youths. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 7.*

Kendall, G. M. (1975). General and social education in correctional treatment. In L. J. Hippchen (Ed.), *Correctional classification and treatment. A reader, 1975.* Cincinnati OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Kerle, K. E. (1972). *Inmate education—U.S. and Europe* (From Prison Research—Needs and Methodologies—See NCJ 042218) Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Kershner, K. M. (1984). Assessment of the impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Guidance Program. Final Report. (State of Pennsylvania).

Kersten, J., & Wolffersdorff-Ehlert, C. (1982). Jugendvollzug oder Jugendstrafvollzug [Juvenile Correction or Juvenile Penal Correction]. *Kriminologisches Journal, 14*(2), 95-106.

Kersting, J. S. (1983). Broader look at work training in correctional settings. In H. E. Pecht (Ed.), *Correctional education—A focus on success.*

Ketterling, M. E. (1970). Rehabilitating women in jail. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 36*, 36-38.

Khan, M. Z. (1982). *Work by jail inmates*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Publication Sales No. NCJ 086842. (Sagar: Department of Criminology and Forensic Science, University of Sauger, India).

Kilty, T. K. (1977). *Study of the characteristics of reading programs in federal, state and city-county penal institutions*. Kalamazoo MI: Western Michigan University.

Kiser, G. C. (1987a, March). Disciplinary problems among inmate college students. *Federal Probation, 51*(1), 42-48.

Kiser, G. C. (1987b, Septemer). Teaching college courses to inmates. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(3), 102-106.

Kittredge, C. (Special to the Globe). (1991, April 14). Women's prison has own reality. *The Boston Sunday Globe*.

Kline, K. (1990). Teacher characteristics and competencies related to substance abuse prevention. *Journal of Drug Education, 20*, 179-89.

Kloss, J. D. (1978). The impact of comprehensive community treatment: An assessment of the complex offender project. *Offender Rehabilitation, 3*, 81-108.

Knepper, P. (1989). Selective participation, effectiveness, and prison college programs. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 14*(2), 109-136.

Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-directed learning: A guide for learners and teachers*. New York: Cambridge Books.

Knowles, M. (1986). *Using learning contracts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M. (1973). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education*. Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Co.

Knox, G. W. (1980). Educational upgrading for youthful offenders. *Children and Youth Services Review, 2*(3), 291-313.

Kohlberg, L. (1986). The just community approach to corrections. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*, 54-58.

Kohlberg, L.(1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona, (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook to socialization*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Koopman, P. R. S. (1983). *Cognitive disorders and syntactical deficiencies in the inmate populations of federal penitentiaries in Canada*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Service Paper Microfiche Service No. NCJ 091210.

Kozol, J. (1985). *Illiterate America*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Kratcoski, P. C., & Kratcoski, L. D. (1982, May). Phoenix program: An educational alternative for delinquent youths. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 33*(2), 17-23.

Kurtz, H., Halpin, R., & Fawns, C. W. (1977). Citizen action programs for jails. In P. Eck & G. English (Eds.), *Incarceration benefits and drawbacks*. Arlington TX: University of Texas at Arlington Research and Service Division, Institute of Urban Studies.

Kurtz, H. A., Mahan, T., Hughes, E., & Daniel, D. B. (unknown). *Manual for rehabilitation programs in small jails*. Denton TX: North Texas State University School of Community Services University Center for Community Services. (Texas Office of the Governor Criminal Justice Division, Austin TX)

(1987). Lafayette Parish Cooperative Jail Project (LPCJP) Phase III Final Report.

Langenbach, M., North, M.Y., Aagaard, L., & Chown, W. (1990, June). Televised instruction in Oklahoma prisons: A study of recidivism and disciplinary actions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(2), 87-94.

Larson, K. A., & Gerber, M. M. (1987, November). Effects of social metacognitive training for enhancing overt behavior in learning disabled and low achieving delinquents. *Exceptional Children, 54*(3), 201-211.

Lattimore, P. K., et al. (1990, April). Experimental assessment of the effect of vocational training on youthful property offenders. *Evaluation Review, 14*(2), 115-33.

Lawrence, R. (1985, March). Jail educational programs. Helping inmates cope with overcrowded conditions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(1), 15-20.

Lawyer, H. L., Coffey, O. D., & Grieser, R. C. (1987). *Evaluation of the 1984 special Congressional initiative for correctional education: Grants and technical assistance for basic education and vocational training: Interim Report to the National Institute of Corrections*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc.

Lee, H. K. (1981). *System dynamic study of a criminal justice system and an appraisal of its correctional education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

184

Lee, R., & Haynes, N. (1980). Project CREST and the dual-treatment approach to delinquency: Methods and research. In R. R. Ross & R. Gendreau (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment.* Toronto, OT: Butterworths.

Lee, T. J. (1988, June). Maverick notion about correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(2), 58-61.

Leone, P. (1984). *Preservice and inservice training for teachers of incarcerated handicapped youth.* Corrections Special Education Training Conference. Arlington, VA. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. No. NCJ 102393.

Leone, P. (1986, May-June). Teacher training in corrections and special education. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(3), 41-47.

Leone, P. E. (1987). Teaching handicapped learners in correctional education programs. In C. M. Nelson, et al. (Eds.) *Special education in the criminal justice system.* Columbus OH: Charles E Merrill Publishing Company.

Leone, P. E. (1985, June). Data-based instruction in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(2), 77-85.

Levison, R. L., & Easterling, R. E. (1974). Predicting work release performance for federal inmates. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 11*(2), 78-84.

Lewis, J. (1985). Counseling minorities within the correctional service. In R. J. Samuda & A. Wolfgang (Eds.) *Intercultural counselling and assessment: Global perspectives.*

Lewis, J. P., & Fickes, J. G. (1976). *Evaluation of 1975 post decondary educational programs in the eight Pennsylvania State correctional institutions.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128650.

Lewis, M. V., Seaman, D. L., & Rabinowitz, W. (1978). *Quality and results of vocational education by correctional institutions.* Final Report. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 164989.

Lewis, M. S., & Shanks, S. (1978). Jail Report, 1977, Vol. 2. Lincoln NE: Contact, Inc. (Part of a 4-volume report)

Liberman, M. A., & Borman, L. D.(1979). *Self-help groups for coping with crisis.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Liberman, R. P., Ferris, C., Salgado, P., & Salgado, J. (1975, Fall). Replication of the achievement place model in California. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis.*

Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education (1965). *National inventory of library needs.* American Library Association, American Correctional Association.

Lichtman, C. M., & Smock, S. M. (1981, January). The effects of social services on probationer recidivism: A field experiment. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency,* 81-100.

Lillyquist, M. J. (1980). *Understanding and Changing Criminal Behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lindeman, E. (1926). *The meaning of adult education.* New York: New Republic.

Linden, R., & Perry, L. (1982, Summer). The effectiveness of prison education programs. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 6*(4), 43-57.

Linden, R., Perry, L., Ayers, D., & Parlett, T. A. (1984, January). An evaluation of a prison education program. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 26*(1), 65-73.

Linsenberg, M. (1975, Spring). Inmate education in Pennsylvania State correctional institutions. *Pennsylvania Association on Probation, Parole, and Correction Quarterly, 32*(1), 13-20.

Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilkes, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

(1988). *Literacy: A concept for all seasons.* Washington, DC: American Correctional Association.

Littlefield, J. F., & Dowling, W. D. (unknown). *Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) as a predictor of success on the revised general educational development tests (GED) in a correctional setting.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 079971.

Littlefield, J. F., & West, S. C. (1990). *Correctional training, industries and education.* Richmond KY: Correctional Education Association, Correctional Industries Association, Department of Correctional Services Training Resource Center.

Littlefield, J. F., & Wolford, B. I. (1982). Survey of higher education in U.S. correctional institutions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(4), 14-18.

(1983). *Lobbying for correctional education—A guide to action.* College Park, MD: Correctional Education Association.

(1982). *Locked up but not locked out—Correctional education is the key.* Huntsville, TX: Correctional Education Association.

Loeffler, C., & Martin, T. (1982). The functional illiterate: Is correctional education doing its job? In H. E. Pecht (Ed.), *Correctional education call for papers.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales No. NCJ 089504.

(1973). Lorton Prison College Project—Third Year Final Report. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

(1985). *Low Level and Non-Reader Program "LNR."* Alabama: Ingram State Technical College, ABE Reading Center.

Lozoff, B. (1985, 1989). *We're all doing time: A guide for getting free.* Durham, NC: Hanuman Foundation; Human Kindness Foundation.

186

Lucas, G. S. (1985). *Volunteer community-based organizations behind walls: A sensible approach to the adult literacy problems (An evolutionary/historical review).*

Luria, A. R. (1976). *Cognitive development: Its cultural and social foundations.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lytle, S., & Wolfe, M. (1989). *Adult literacy education: Program evaluation and learner assessment.* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education & Center on Education and Training for Employment No. ED 315665.

MacCormick, A. (1931). *The education of adult prisoners.* New York: The National Society of Penal Information.

MacDonald, D. G. (1986). *Follow-up study of a sample of offenders who earned high school equivalency diplomas while incarcerated.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 105929

MacDonald, D. G., & Bala, G. (1987). *Follow-up study of a sample of offenders who participated in food services program.* Rockville MD: National Insitute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 111490.

Mace, J. L. (1978). *Effect of correctional institutions' education programs on inmates' societal adjustment, as measured by post-release recidivism.* (Doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/03A,* 1296..

Maciekowich, Z. D. (1976). *Academic education/vocational training and recidivism of adult prisoners.* (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 37/08A.* (University Microfilms No. 77-03-087).

MacNeil, P. (1980). Organizational barriers to the administration of correctional education: An analysis of a correctional school district. *Adult Education, 30,* 208-221.

Maddox, M., et al. (1984). Transitioning adjudicated youth back to community schools. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(4), 124-128.

Maradian, S. (1981). *Maximizing educational opportunity through community resources.* Proceedings of the 36th Annual Correctional Education Association Conference. (pp. 81-85).

Markley, H., Flynn, K., & Bercaw-Dooen, S. (1983). Offender skills training and employment success. An evaluation of outcomes. *Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, 29*(1), 1-11.

Martin, S. K. C. (1979a). *Academic performance analysis, Volume I.* Inmates Reporting Twelfth Grade Education. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 068072.

Martin, S. K. C. (1979b). *Academic performance snalysis, Volume 2.* Total Tested Inmate Population. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 068073.

Martinson, R. (1979). New findings, new views: A note of caution regarding sentencing reform. *Hofstra Law Review, 7,* 243-258.

Martinson, R. (1974, Spring). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest, 35,* 22-54.

Marye, L. (1979). *New Orleans (LA) criminal sheriff's cooking and baking program—Evaluation Report.* Rockville, MD: National Insititute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 063234. (New Orleans Mayor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council; U.S. Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)

Mason, R., Seidler, A., & Lowry, H. M. (1978). *Post-release outcomes for participants in prison training programs. A study.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 067647.

Mauer, M. (1991). *Americans behind bars: A comparison of international rates of incarceration.* Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.

Mauers, A. J. (1974). Learning disabilities and delinquent youth. In B. L. Kratoville, *Youth in trouble.* A Symposium, May 2-3, 1974. San Rafael, CA: Academic Therapy Publications.

Maulfair, V. E., & Spears, J. C. (1981). *Implementation of PL 94-142 in a Juvenile Correctional Facility (from Proceedingsof the 36th annual correctional education association conference).* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program.

Maxwell, W. W. (1987, April). Take note: Educating segregated inmates. *Corrections Today, 29*(2), 106, 108, 110, 112.

McCain, J. A., & McNally, R. B. (1982, Fall/Winter). Social programs and correctional control in a maximum security environment. The case of Attica. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rebabilitation, 6*(1), 103-10.

McCarthy, B. (1985, October). Nature of education within Canadian Federal prisons. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 27*(4), 441-453.

McClane, K. A. (1987, Spring). Walls: A journey to Auburn. *Community Review, 7*(2), 5-14.

McCollum, S. G. (Postsecondary Education Programs for Prisoners). (1975). Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126830.

McCollum, S. G. (1985, September). Computers can help. *Federal Probation, 44*(3), 35-39.

188

McCollum, S. (1978, Special Issue). Latino prisoners in the USA (United States of America) Managing effective participation. *Quarterly Journal of Corrections, 2*(2), 42-45.

McCollum, S. G. (1989). Mandatory literacy for prisons. In S. Duguid (Ed.), *Yearbook of correctional education.* (pp. 209-223). Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

McCollum, S. G. (1990, June). Mandatory programs in prisons—Let's expand the concept. *Federal Probation, 54*(2), 33-35.

McCollum, S. G. (1989). Preparation for tomorrow's jobs: Experimental curricula. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(2), 60-63.

McCollum, S. G. (1977). What works: A look at effective correctional education and training experiences. *Federal Probation, 41*, 32-35.

McCord, J. (1977). *Correctional group counseling: An evaluation.* Paper presented at the National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation.

McCord, W., & Sanchez, J. (1983, April). The treatment of deviant children: A twenty-five year follow-up study. *Crime and Delinquency, 29*(2), 238-53.

McGlone, J., & Mayer, J. (1987, June). Ohio industries and education. A vital TIE (Training, Industries and Education). *Corrections Today, 49*(3), 32-34.

McGrail, J. (1984). Adult illiterates and adult literacy programs: A summary of descriptive data.

McGurk, B. J., Bolton, N., & Smith, M. (1978). Some psychological, educational, and criminological variables related to recidivism in delinquent boys. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17*, 251-254.

McHolland, J. D. (1976). *Human potential seminar: A positive approach to self-development.* Evanston, IL: National Centre for Human Potential Seminars and Services.

McKee, J. M. (1972). *Hardware and software for adult basic education in corrections.* University, AL: Rehabilitation Research Foundation.

McKee, J. M., Roy, S. F., Jenkins, W. O., Carmen, A. C., & Hart, L. A. (1970). *Acquisition of standard English speech habits using second-language techniques. An experiment in speech modification and generalization in the verbal behavior of prison inmates.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 017206.

McKelvey, B. (1936). *American prisons: A study in American social history prior to 1915.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McKenna, J. J. (1974). Pennsylvania Teacher Restoration Intern Program at the State correctional institutions at Dallas (DS-350-73A), Graterford (DS-351-73A), and Camp Hill (DS-352-73A) Final External Evaluation Report. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 026180. (Pennsylvania Governor's Justice Commission)

McLaughlin, P. (1986). Computer-based education: The best of ERIC, 1983-85.

McLean, F. (1986). Meeting the educational needs of young offenders. *Guidance and Counseling, 1*(5), 46-49.

McMahon, W. G. (1986). Learning disabilities and criminal involvement: Prevention, advocacy and training.

McRandle, C. C., & Goldstein, R. (1986, December). Hearing loss in two prison populations. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(4), 147-155.

McVey, R. F. (1977). *Establishing a college orientation program for ex-offenders.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 147677.

Mebane, B. G. (1976). *Differential life history factors among incarcerated female offenders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University.

Menninger, K. (1968). The crime of punishment.

MESA Corporation, R. V. (1985). *Education in correctional settings. A guide for developing quality vocational and adult basic education programs.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales. No. NCJ 100799.

Mesinger, J. F. (1984a). Megatrends relating to adolescent violence and correctional education.

Mesinger, J. F. (1984b, September). Some thoughts on integrating special education with correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(3), 77-79.

Meussling, V. (1984, December). The emotional climate of the interpersonal classroom in a maximum security prison for males. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(4), 112-117.

Michalek, W. (March, 1988). Correctional education: Skill acquisition and moral enterprise. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(1), 6-10.

Middleton, L. (1981). College programs in prisons grow rapidly in vocational education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 23,* 6-7.

Milan, M. A., Wood, L. F., & MacKee, J. M. (1979, Summer). Motivating academic achievement in a cellblock token economy. An elaboration of the Premack Principle. *Offender Rehabilitation, 3*(4), 349-361.

Miller, J. L. (1982, Spring). Beyond curriculum: A survival guide to teaching in prison. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 6*(1), 1-9.

Miller, R. D., Maier, G. J., & Kaye, M. S. (1988, July). Orienting the staff of a new maximum security forensic facility. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 39*(7), 780-81.

Miller, W. H., & Windhauser, E. (1971). Reading disability: Tendency toward delinquency? *Clearinghouse, 46,* 183-186.

Millot, K. (1982). *Higher education in the Illinois Correctional System.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois.

Minahan, J. (1990, March). Mapping the world: Some thoughts on teaching the humanities in prison. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(1), 14-19.

Mitchell, A. (1981, October). Dawn of solar training. *Corrections Magazine, 7*(5), 41-45.

Monroe, W. E., Smith, C. L., & Robinson, R. W. (1975). *Cooperative follow-up project of the Windham School District and the Texas Department of Corrections.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ERIC No. 131318.

Montgomery, D. M., & Rosamond, S. P. (1987, March). SEED curriculum (Social, Emotional, Educational Development). *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(1), 12-16.

Moore, E. J., & Miller, T. B. (1979, March). Career development in correctional institutions. Needs, programs, and practices. *Journal of Career Education, 5*(3), 185-193.

Morin, L. (Ed.). (1981). *On prison education.* Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Morris, N. (1974). *The future of imprisonment.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(1987). Moving California correctional education into the future: Directions and strategies. Transfer of Knowledge Workshop. Sacramento CA.

Mulligan, W. (1972, November). Dyslexia, specific learning fisability and felinquency. *Juvenile Justice, 23*(3), 20-24.

Murray, C. (1976). *The link between learning disabilities and juvenile deliquency: Current theory and knowledge.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Muth, W. R. (1988). Federal prison system reading programs.

Muth, W. R., & Gehring, T. (1986, March). The correctional education/prison reform link: 1913-1940 and conclusion. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(1), 14-17.

(1981). National Conference on Prison Education.Proceedings. Victoria, British Columbia. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Association for Adult Education.

(1984). National Forum on Building Relationships for Educational Excellence in Corrections Proceedings. Crystal City VA.

(1984). National Forum on Building Relationships for Educational Excellence in Corrections Proceedings. Crystal City VA.

National Institute of Justice. (1973). *California—Department of the Youth Authority education program, September, 1973.* Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 011688.

National Institute of Justice. (1977b). *California Department of The Youth Authority compensatory education, 1976-1977: Program description and evaluation*. Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 047407.

National Institute of Justice. (1977a). *California Youth Authority and California Department of Corrections vocational program effectiveness, October 1977*. Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 055314.

National Institute of Justice. (1983). *Compensatory education: Program description and evaluation, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 1, 1981-82*. Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 092721.

National Institute of Justice. Maryland Committee to Re-Involve Ex-Offenders, Answer—Education. A Special Report on the Rehabilitative Needs of Maryland Prisoners. Rockville MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 030159.

Nelson, O., et al. (1988). Corrections education evaluation system model.

(1967). New Careers Development Project: Final Report, 1967. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales No. NCJ 010805.

(1978). *New Hampshire State Prison. Education Department Handbook.* Concord NH: New Hampshire State Prison.

Newman, A., & Beverstock, C. (1990). *Adult literacy: Contexts and challenges.* Bloomington IN: International Reading Association and ERIC/RCS.

Newman, A., Metz, E., & Patrick, E. (1992) Consult-I(R) Reading Ohio Project: Final report. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Reading Practicum Center.

(1985). New partnerships. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction. No. NCJ 101663.

Niven, J., & Readio, S. (1977). Oak Harbor, Washington, Transitional School Project Program Evaluation. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 042375.

Nixon, M., & Bumbarger, C. S. (1983, December). Education programs in provincial correctional centres. *Journal of Correctional Education, 34*(4), 127-131.

Nixon, M., & Bumbarger, C. S. (1983). Extending educational opportunities to provincial prison inmates. *Education Canada, 23*, 5-8.

Norde, G. S. (1980, Winter). Certain sociological characteristic differences in the correctional education learners and the public school learners. Reflection of teacher education for correctional education. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 5*(2), 85-93.

Nordwall, A. (1974). *Need for education programs for American Indians in the prisons*. Arlington, VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113095.

(1979). North Carolina Division of Youth Services, Institutional Services, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1978-79. North Carolina Division of Youth Serices.Serving North Carolina Children, 1979. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 077435.

O'Brien, E. L., & Arbetman, L. P. (1978). New clinical curriculum. Teaching practical law to high school students and inmates. *Journal of Legal Education, 29*(4), 568-576.

O'Donnel, C. R., Lydgate, T., & Fo, W. S. O. (1979). The buddy system: Review and follow-up. *Child Behavior Therapy, 1*(2), 161-169.

O'Hayre, B. B., & Coffey, O. D. (1982). *Current utilization of PELL grants by men and women incarcerated in state correctional facilities. A brief summary*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 085968.

O'Neil, M. J. (1988). *Study of correctional post-secondary education and its possible impact on recidivism*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi.

O'Neil, M. (1990, March). Correctional higher education: Reduced recidivism? *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(1), 28-31.

Oakley, N. (1988). Who's learning how to read and how do we know? Project: LEARN Program Description.

Ohlin, L. E. (1977). Correctional strategies in conflict. In R. M. Carter (Ed.), *Correctional institutions* (2nd Edition). (pp. 475-482). Springfield IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Ohlin, L. E. (1986). *The future of rehabilitation: Plotting the course*. Paper presented at the Conference on Reaffirming Rehabilitation.

Omark, R. (1976). Sociology inside maximum security: Some notes on teaching convicted felons in two prisons. *High School Behavioral Science, 4*, 11-18.

Orsagh, T., & Marsden, M. E. (1984). *Rational choice theory and offender rehabilitation*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Osborne, T. M. (1934). *Prisons and common sense*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.

Osborne, T. M. (1916). *Society and prisons*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ostrom, T. M., Steele, C. M., Rosenblood, L. K., & Mirels, H. L. (1971). Modification of delinquent behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 1*(2), 118-136.

(1988). Oversight Report on Board of Correctional Education and Correctional Education School Authority. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program. (Florida House of Representatives Committee on Corrections, Probation and Parole) No. NCJ 118289.

Owram, D. (1986). *The government generation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Palfrey, C. (1974). Remedial education and the adult offender. *Howard Journal of Penology and Crime Prevention, 15*(1), 78-85.

Parker, E. A. (1990, September). Social-psychological impact of a college education on the prison inmate. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(3), 140-46.

Pass, M. G. (1988, Spring-Summer). Race relations and the implications of education within prison. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 12*(2), 145-51.

Pasternack, R. O. (1988, December). Providing an appropriate education to adjudicated and incarcerated juvenile delinquents: The challenge to correctional education administrators. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(4), 154-59.

Pasternack, R., & Lyon, R. (1982 June). Clinical and empirical identification of learning disabled juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(2), 7-13.

Patrick, E. A., & Fattu, J. M. (1986). *Artificial intelligence with statistical pattern recognition.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Paulson, D. (April, 1977). Training wheels. Launching a mobile teaching system. *Law Enforcement Communications, 4*(2), 16, 18, 44-45.

Pawasarat, J., et al. (1982). Educational follow-up study of juveniles released from Ethan Allen and Lincoln Hills (Wisconsin) Schools.

Peak, K. (1984, June). Postsecondary correctional education: Contemporary program nature and delivery systems in the U.S. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(2), 58-62.

Pearson, A. (1971, May). Education in the New Holloway Prison for Women. England. *Adult Education, 44*(1), 33-36.

Pecht, H. E. (1983, September). The emergent correctional education (CE) profession: Special problems require tested criteria for the selection of effective teachers. *Journal of Correctional Education, 34*(3), 85-88.

Peifer, J. E., & Cook, L. A. (1984). Review of educational programs in juvenile institutions 1983-84 and implications for special education.

Pelzer, D. F. (1985). Comparing job placement of vocationally trained and untrained inmates while residing at a community correctional center in Florida.

Pendleton, E. P. (1988, June). Student-centered instruction: A prison college model for building self-esteem. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(2), 82-84.

Pennington, L. (1979). Performance contracting: Its influence on achievement and attitude of youthful offenders in education programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 30*, 14-15.

(1978). Pennsylvania Criminal Justice Projects Evaluation Final Report, Second Year, 1978: Executive Summary. Middletown, PA: Pennsylvania State University Institute of State and Regional Affairs.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1987). *Crime and punishment, war, violence and peacemaking.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Penal Abolition.

Petersen, J. L. (1975). *Correctional education model for underachieving young adult Afro-American male correctional clients from New York City (NY).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.

Pfannenstiel, J. C., & Keesling, J. W. (1980). *Compensatory education and confined youth—A final report.* National Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Youth, Vol. 5.Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 077928.

Phillips, C. W. (1974). Department of Labor manpower programs in corrections. National Workshop on Corrections and Parole Administration, Second Proceedings. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 085061.

Phillips, E. L., Phillips, R. A., Fixsen, D. L., & Wolf, M. W. (1973). Behavior shaping works for delinquents. *Psychology Today, 6*, 75-79.

Phillips, J., & Wagner, D. (1977). *Review of corrections education policy for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.* Final Report, 1977. Springfield VA: National Technical Information Service.

Pierce, C., & Mason, R. (1976). *Correctional education: A forgotten human service.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Pinton, G. A. (1978). *Bilingual program in a community correctional center. Sharing problems, ideas, experiences, and resource information.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 154626.

Pinton, G. A. (unknown). Functional competency in correctional life. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 084643.

Pinton, G. A. (1982). *Multiple role recognition of the educator of socially isolated persons.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 084642.

Pisciotta, A. W. (1983, April). Race, sex, and rehabilitation: A study of differential treatment in the juvenile reformatory, 1825-1900. *Crime and Delinquency, 29*(2), 254-69.

(1978). *Planning consumer education programs for residents of prisons and pre-release centers.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 159118.

Platt, J. J., Perry, G., & Metzger, D. S. (1980). The evaluation of a heroin addiction treatment program within a correctional environment. In R. R. Ross & P. Gendreau (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment.* Toronto: Butterworths.

Platt, J. S., Simpson, R. L., Regan, M. K., & Reusser, P. G. (1977, March). Effects of tutoring on the academic achievement self-concept and social behavior of delinquent adolescent males. *Quarterly, 24*(1), 31-35.

Platt, J. S., Tunick, R. H., & Wienke, W. D. (1982, February). Developing the work and life skills of handicapped inmates. *Corrections Today, 44*(1), 66, 68-73.

Platt, J. S., Wienke, W. D., & Tunick, R. H. (1982, January). Need for training in special education for correctional educators. *Journal of Correctional Education, 32*(4), 8-12.

Policy Institute, S. N. York. (1973). *School behind bars. A descriptive overview of correctional education in the American prison system.* Washington, DC: ERIC National Institute of Education. (Issued in three unnumbered volumes)

Poliuka, L. (1986). *Juvenile justice, education and employment.* Eric Document Reproduction Service, ED 268468.

Pollack, R. (1979, September). ABCs of prison education. *Corrections Magazine, 5*(3), 60-66.

Poorkaj, J., & Bockelman, C. (1973, April). The impact of community volunteers on delinquency prevention. *Sociology & Social Research*, pp. 335-341.

Post, C. H. (1981, February-March). Link between learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency cause, effect and "present solutions." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 32*(1), 58-68.

Potts, M., & Tichenor, J. (1989). Project PROVE (Parolees and Probationers Realize Opportunities Via Education: Research Report.

Potuto, J. R. (1980). Operational plan for realistic prison employment. *Wisconsin Law Review*, (2), 291-331.

Powell, W. C. (1975, December). Educational intervention as a preventive measure. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 2*(4), 397-407.

Pownall, G. A. (1971). *Employment problems of released prisoners.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration.

Price, T., & Price L. (1980, June). Correctional education. A humanistic and treatment approach. *Journal of Correctional Education, 31*(2), 8-12.

Price, T., & Vitolo, R. (1985). Educational services for handicapped students in correctional settings.

(1978). Prison education two: The teacher's role. *Educational Magazine, 35*(1), 3-11.

(1978). *Prisoner education. A select bibliography—Australia.* Phillip Act, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Pritchard, C. J. (1980). *Teaching women prisoners to write.* Paper presented to Conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington, DC.

(1981). Proceedings of the 36th Annual Correctional Education Association Conference, Volume 1. Costa Mesa, CA. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 085125. Correctional Education Association, Huntsville, TX.

Profiles in Inmate Training Projects. (1971). *Evaluation of MDTA training in correctional institutions, Volume 2: Profiles in inmate training projects.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration.

(1984). Programming for institutionalized youth. Washington, DC: Arthur D. Little, Inc., & U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

(1982). Program suggestions for juvenile detention facilities. The Special Education Process in Michigan.

A Projection for the Future. (1977). *Correctional education—A projection for the future.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 186797.

Project REAL. (1984). *Engaging the serious youth offender in employment and training.* CSS/Project REAL.

(1974). *Project Intercept. Final Report.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 019964. (Colorado Judicial Department, Denver CO)

(1977). Project Read: Annual Report, 1976-77. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 040594.

(1974). *Proposal to train persons under the manpower training act, 1973-74.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 026541. (Pace Institute of Chicago, Cook County Department of Corrections)

Quay, H. C., & Love, C. T. (1977). The effect of juvenile diversion program on rearrests. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 4*(4), 377-396.

Quick, T. (1990, May/June). Wackenhut Corrections Corporation—Central Texas Parole Violator Facility: A Modern Posture for Education Programs. *American Jails, 4*(1), 21-23.

Quinney, R. (1987). *Criminology and the way of peace.* Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology.

Ragen, J. (1962). *The world's toughest prison.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Rahn, R. C. (1979). *Cognitive abilities of incarcerated criminals*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 067643.

Rankin, W., & Haugerud, R. (1976). *First year evaluation of the jails and individualized learning project. Citizen and Offender Programs in Education, Inc., Milwaukee, Wisconsin*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 078886.

Ratcliff, K., Taylor, B., & Joine, R. (1974). *St. Louis City Juvenile Court, Providence Education Center. Field Review and Project Evaluation Report*. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 015618.

Rauch, D. (1981). Education for the growing majority: Adults. *Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 5*, 12-13.

(1984). Reading and study skills and instruction: College and adult: Abstracts of doctoral dissertations published in "Dissertation abstracts international" January through June 1984, 44(7-12).

Author unknown. Reading program profiles in correctional institutions. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.

(1974). Reading program resource manual for adult basic education. Washington, DC. American Bar Association.

Reagen, M. S., & Stoughton, D. (Eds.). (1976). *Schools behind bars: A descriptive overview of correctional education in the American prison system*. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.

(1981, February). Recreation in corrections. *Parks and Recreation, 16*(2), complete issue.

Rector, J. (1981). Learning disabilities and juvenile offenders. Prevention and diversion. In J. A. Cox (Ed.), *Learning disabled delinquents. Issues and programming*. (pp. 70-81). Pensacola FL: Lakeview Center, Inc.

Reed, W. E. (1982). *Motivation of inmates for college enrollment and the effect of higher education and vocational training upon inmate discipline*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sam Houston State University.

(1977). *Reevaluation needed of educational assistance for institutionalized neglected or delinquent children*. Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service.

(1978). Resource and reference guide for education and leisure activity managers and personnel in the federal prison system—Education handbook. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Author unknown. Resource directory. Washington, DC: Prison Fellowship.

Revere, A. B. (1989, Winter). Pioneer black woman superintendent: Velma Dolphin Ashley, 1944-1956. *Equity and Excellence, 24*(2), 62-63.

Reynolds, J. (1982). *Incarcerated students: Change and conflict. Correctional Education Association, Locked up but not locked out. Correctional education is the key.* Rockville, MD: National Insitute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction Sales No. NCJ 089914.

Rice, E. (1980). *Assessment of quality vocational education in state prisons.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: System Sciences, Inc.

Rickard, P. L., & Stiles, R. L. (1985, June). Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) design for effective assessment in correctional education programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(2), 51-53.

Rigg, P, & Kazemek, F. E. (1987). *Four inmates read: An examination of assessment.* Unpublished paper.

Riggs, D., & True, J. (1981). Kentucky's inmate college program. The program and the participants. Frankfurt KY: Kentucky Department of Justice Bureau of Corrections Research and Evaluation Section.

(1975). Right to treatment/right to an education/rights of victims. Second National Conference on Juvenile Justice. Reno, NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

Rivera, W. M., & Walker, S. M. (1985). Lifelong Learning Research Conference Proceedings (7th). College Park, Maryland.

Roberts, A. R., & Coffey, O. D. (1976). State of the art survey for a correctional education network. U.S. Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

Roberts, A. R. (Ed). (1973). *Readings in prison education.* Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Roberts, A. R. (1971). *Sourcebook on prison education: Past, present, and future.* Springfield IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Roberts, A. R. & Schervish, P. (1988). A strategy for making decisions and evaluating alternative juvenile offender treatment programs: Compensating for missing information. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 11*(2), 115-122.

Roberts, L. H. (1989, December). Inmate education in Florida's 19th century penal system: A failure of good intentions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(4), p 148-150.

Rohm, K. G. (1989). Corrections education—Is it effective? An evaluation.

Romig, D. A. (1978). *Justice for our children.* Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Rose, N., & Williams, K. (1989, September). Two-year study on the effectiveness of computer-assisted instruction in a short term program. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(3), 116-118.

Ross, R. R. (1978). Reading and rehabilitation. *Crime And/Et Justice, 6*(4), 207-219.

Ross, R. R. (1988, June). (Re)Habilitation through education: A cognitive model for vorrections. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(2), 44-47.

Ross, R. R. (1990). *Time to think: A cognitive model of offender rehabilitation and deliquency prevention.* Ottawa, ONT: Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa.

Ross, R. R., & Fabiano, E. A. (1983, July). *The cognitive model of crime and delinquency prevention and rehabilitation: I. Assessment procedures.* Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services.

Ross, R., & Fabiano, E. (1985). *Time to think: A cognitive model of delinquency prevention and offender rehabilitation.* Johnson City, Tennessee: Institute of Social Sciences and Arts.

Ross, R. R., Fabiano, E., & Ross, R. D. (1988). *Reasoning and rehabilitation: A handbook for teaching cognitive skills.* Ottawa: Cognitive Centre.

Ross, R. R., & Gendreau, P. (1980). *Effective correctional treatment.* Toronto: Butterworths.

Ross, R. R., & McKay, H. B. (1979). *Self-mutilation.* Lexington MA: Lexington Books.

Ross, R. R., & McKay, H. B. (1976). A Study of Institutionalized Treatment Programs. International *Journal of Offender Therapy and Offender Criminology, 20*(2), 167-173.

Rothaizer, J. M. (1981). Short-term cognitive education of juvenile offenders. (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University). (NCJ No. 086276).

Roundtree, G. A. (1979). *Self-esteem and social adjustment. An experimental study of the effects of a mathematical educational model on self-esteem of male prison inmates.* Calcutta India: Minerva Associates.

Roundtree, G. A., Edwards, D. W., & Dawson, S. H. (1982). Effects of education on self-esteem of male prison inmates. *Journal of Correctional Education, 32*(4), 12-18.

Roundtree, G. A., et al. (1984, Spring). A study of the personal characteristics of probationers as related to recidivism. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 8*(3), 53-61.

Roush, D. W. (1983, Spring-Summer). Content and process of detention education. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 7*(3-4), 21-36.

Rowh, M. (1985). The neglected enterprise: Vocational education in America's prisons.

Russell, P., & Salm, D. (1989). Legislation on juvenile justice issues. Wisconsin Legislative Council Report No. 11 to the 1989 Legislature.

Ruth, G. A. (1974, September). Cregier outpost: A therapeutic response to the juvenile offender. *Federal Probation, 38*(3), 43-49.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr. (1988, Summer). Correctional special education. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 20*(4), 52-54.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., & Bigelow, S. S. (1985). Special education in adult and juvenile corrections.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., et al. (1986a). Correctional/special education training project. Final report.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., et al. (1985, Spring). Special education in the most restrictive environment: Correctional/special education. *Journal of Special Education, 19*(1), 59-71.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., & Others. (1986b, May-June). Special education programming in juvenile corrections. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(3), 27-33.

Rutherford, R. B., Jr., & Bower, K. B. (1976, Spring). Role of special education in juvenile corrections. *New England Journal on Criminal Law, 2*(2), 155-163.

Ryan, J. L. (Compiler). (1989). *Literacy collection development in libraries: A bibliography.* (2nd revised edition).

Ryan T A. (1977). *Correctional education—The future challenge.* Rockville MD: National Insitute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Paper Reproduction SalesNo. NCJ 074751.

Ryan, T. A. (1983). Development of a master plan. *Journal of Correctional Education, 34*(4), 115-119.

Ryan, T. A. (1971). *Education for correctional settings—A book of readings.* Hawaii University. Papers prepared for the 1971 Regional Seminars on Adult Basic Education in Corrections.

Ryan, T. A. (1982, September). The individualized adult life skills system. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(3), 27-33.

Ryan, T. A. (1991). Literacy training and reintegration of offenders. *Forum on Corrections Research, 3*(1), 17-23.

Ryan, T. A. (1989). A transitional program for female offenders. In S. Duguid (Ed.), *Yearbook of correctional education.* (pp. 209-223). Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

Ryan, T. A., & Woodard, J. J., Woodard, C. (1987). *Correctional education: A state of the art.* Washington DC: National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice.

Sadd, S., et al. (1983). Alternative youth employment strategies project. Final Report.

(1974). *St. Louis Providence Education Center—Exemplary project validation report.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 036497. San Francisco, CA: Urban and Rural Systems Associates.

Sainz, J., & Biggins, C. (1979). *Literacy: A tool for assisting the Hispanic inmate.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 179948.

Samenow, S. E. (1984). *Inside the criminal mind.* New York, NY: Times Books.

Sandman, R. S., & Welch, W. W. (1978). *Evaluation of Title One computer-assisted instruction (CAI) programs at Minnesota State Correctional Institutions.* Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 189125. (University of Minnesota Minnesota Research and Evaluation Center and Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium)

Sarason, I. G. (1968). Verbal learning, modelling, and juvenile delinquency. *American Psychologist, 23*(4), 254-266.

Sawyer, R., & Cosgrove, S. (Eds). (1989). *Learning behind bars: Selected educational programs from juvenile, jail and prison facilities.*

Saxton, S. F. (1991) personal communication.

Schaeffer, E. R., & Shannon, T. P. (1983). A follow-up study of vocational education graduates from the Ohio Central School System during fiscal year 1979. Final report

Scharf, P. (1981). Idea of fairness as the basis for the educational reform of the prison. In L. Morin (Ed.), *On prison education.* (pp. 230-244). Hull, Quebec, Canada: Canadian Government Publishing Centre Supply and Services Canada.

Schlossman, S. (1983). Studies in the history of early 20th century delinquency prevention. (A Rand Note)

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professional think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Schulman, M. D., & Canak, W. L. (1976, Winter). Pedagogy in prisons. The structure and practice of teaching sociology in a total institution. *Wisconsin Sociologist, 13*(1), 30-39.

Schumacker, R. E., Anderson, D. B., & Anderson, S. L. (1990, March). Vocational and academic indicators of parole success. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(1), 8-13.

Schumacker, R. E. (1990, March). Vocational and academic indicators of parole success. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(1), 8-13.

Schweber, C. (1977). *Sexual integration and prison education. A study of the educational opportunities for women inmates in the single sex, partially integrated, fully integrated, federal prisons, 1975-76.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Schwitzgebel, R. (1964). *Streetcorner research: An experimental approach to the juvenile delinquent.* London: Oxford University Press.

Scott, S. (1979). Information needs and reading interests of adult prisoners. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 174869.

Seashore, M. J., Haberfeld, S., Irwin, J., & Baker, K. (1976). *Prisoner education: Project New Gate and other college programs.* New York: Praeger.

Seay, D. M. (1968). *Roles of the teachers for the effective use of programmed instruction (P.I.) in a correctional setting.* University AL: Rehabilitation Research Foundation.

Sebring, R. H., & Duffee, D. (1977). Who are the real prisoners? A case of win-lose conflict in a state correctional institution. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 13*(1), 23-40.

Sedlak, K. M. (1975). *Employment opportunities for the released prisoner in relation to his work history and vocational training and work experience in prison.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 031630.

Seidman, E., Rappaport, J., & Davidson, W. S. (1980). Adolescents in legal jeopardy: Initial success and replication of an alternative to the criminal justice system. In R. R. Ross & P. Gendreau, (Eds.), *Effective correctional treatment.* Toronto: Butterworths.

Select Committee of Experts on Education in Prison. (1989). *Final Activity Report on Education in Prisons.* Strasbourg: The Council of Europe.

Seminars on Prison Education Series. (1985). Prisoner as Student. Burnaby, BC, Canada: Simon Fraser University Prison Education Program Office of Continuing Studies.

Semmens, R. A. (1989, June). Practical theory in correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 40*(2), 90-94.

Shadoian, R. C. (1976). *Education programs offered by the California Department of the Youth Authority.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 060208.

Shea, G. F. (1973). *The effects of reality therapy group counseling with delinquent, behavior-disordered students.* (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34/08A, 4889.

Shelton, E. (1985, June). The implementation of a life coping skills program within a correctional setting. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(2), 41-45.

Sherer, M. (1983). Incarceration Period and Educational Achievement of Juvenile Delinquents. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 10*(1), 109-120.

Shinbaum, M. G. (1977). *Development of a model for prediction of inmate interest in prison-sponsored academic and vocational education.* (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University). Disseration Abstracts International, 38/05A, 2470. (University Microfilms No. 77-24-505)

Shore, M. F., & Massimo, J. L. (1979). Fifteen years after treatment: A follow-up study of comprehensive vocationally-oriented psychotherapy. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49*(2), 240-245.

Shuman, C. C. (1976). *Effects of vocational education on recidivism of formerly incarcerated individuals.* (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38/02A, 753. (University Microfilms No. 77-13-298)

Simms, B. E., Farley, J., & Littlefield, J. F. (1987). *Colleges with fences: A handbook for improving corrections education programs.* Columbus OH: Ohio State University National Center for Research.

Singer, N. M. (1976, January). Value of inmate manpower. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 13*(1), 3-12.

Sloan, H. N., & Ralph, J. L. (1969). A behavior modification program in Nevada. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 17,* 290-296.

Smith, C. E. (1987, December). Legal education in prisons: Special problems and opportunities for correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 38*(4), 132-36.

Smith, R. R. (1982, Winter). Home furlough and study release in American adult corrections. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 7*(2), 75-80.

Sorenson, V. (1981, May/June). Educational and vocational needs of women in prison. *Corrections Today, 43*(3), 61-67, 69.

Sowles, R. C., & Gill, J. H. (1970). Institutional and community adjustment of delinquents following counseling. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*(3), 398-402.

(1981). *Special education needs of young adult offenders—An assessment of the impacts of PL (Public Law) 94-142 on the rehabilitative school authority and the Department of Corrections.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice/National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 080636.

Spellacy, F. J., & Brown, W. G. (1984, July). Prediction of recidivism in young offenders after brief institutionalization. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40*(4), 1070-74.

Srivastava, R. K. (1986). Functional retardation: A critical focus for adult correctional education. In J. F. Littlefield (Ed.), Call for papers. Correctional Education Association 1986 Annual Conference. Cincinnati, OH.

(1988). Standards for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Education Programs.

Stayer, R. J. (1975). *Steuben County, New York, jail treatment program.* Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 035804. (U.S. Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration)

Stevens, R. D. (1981). *Effects of selected demographic characteristics on general educational development (GED) participant success and recidivism within Georgia correctional facilities* Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia. University Microfilms No. 82-01-581.

Stevens, R. D. (1986, October). The effect on recidivism of attaining the general education development diploma. *Journal of Offender Counseling, 7*(1), 3-9.

Stewart, J. K. (1985). Remarks by James K. Stewart to National Conference on Correctional Education. Arlington, VA.

Stewart, M. C. (1990, Winter). Prince Georges County Department of Corrections: Reading Comprehension Test. *American Jails, 3*(4), 23, 25-26.

Sticht, T. (1990). Correspondences among TABE, ABLE, and CASAS tests used in adult literacy programs for JOBS, JTPA, and ABE. Paper presented at the North American Conference for Adult and Adolescent Literacy, Washington, DC.

Stowell, G. F. (1974). *Work and educational release in Connecticut—An analysis of post-release effects on inmate participants.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 019605.

Strategies of Intervention. (1981). *Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation,* 6, 139, NCJ No. 086047.

(1972). Study of reading disorders in relation to poverty and crime. Final Report. Springfield VA: National Technical Information Service.

Sua, D. W. (1989). A comparison of correctional adult educators and formal adult educators in terms of their expressed beliefs in the collaborative teaching mode. *Theory and Methods of Adult Education.*

Sutton, J. R. (1983, March). Social structure, institutions, and the legal status of children in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology, 88*(5), 915-47.

Tacardon, M. (1983). Social work education in corrections. Teaching what we practice, practicing what we teach. In H. E. Pecht (Ed.), *Correctional education. A focus on success.*

Tahash, G. J. (1980, March). Training of prison inmates as welding operators. *Welding Journal,* 17-24.

Tam, T. S., & Rogers, S. (1978). *Examination of adult training centers in Ontario, Canada, I. Participants and their expectations.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program.

Tannenbaum, F. (1933). *Osborne of Sing Sing.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Tarbell, H. S. (1870). The prison school. In E.C. Wines, (Ed.), *Transactions of the national congress on penitentiary and reformatory discipline.* (pp. 193-203). Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons and Co., Printers.

Tappan, P. W. (1960). *Crime, justice and correction.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, A. J. (1967). An evaluation of group psychotherapy in a girl's borstal. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 17*(2), 168-177.

Teitelbaum, H. S. (1974). Ingham county (MI) jail rehabilitation program evaluation report. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference.

Texas Department of Corrections. (1979). Development of a career education delivery system for correctional institutions. Huntsville, TX: Texas Department of Corrections.

(1976). Thomas A. Edison College special program for correctional systems (SPCS). Final report of the project director, October 15, 1976. Princeton, NJ: Thomas A. Edison College and Garden State School District.

Thomas, J. (1983a). Justice as interaction: Loose coupling and mediations in the adversary process. *Symbolic Interaction, 6*, 243-260.

Thomas, R. G., & Thomas, R. M. (1988, March). Evolution of a prison adaptive health program. *Journal of Correctional Education, 39*(1), 30-35.

Thompson, J. A. (1979). *An analytic model designed to predict inmate success for management of a prison-based college degree program.* Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University.

Thompson, W. E., Dodder, R. A. (1986, Summer). Containment theory and juvenile delinquency: A reevaluation through factor analysis. *Adolescence, 21*(82), 365-376.

Thorpe, T., et al. (1984, September). Follow-up study of offenders who earn college degrees while incarcerated in New York State. *Journal of Correctional Education, 35*(3), 86-88.

TIE Monograph. (1990). Correctional training, industries and education. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.

Timmins, W. M. (1989). Prison education in Utah: From "The Penwiper" to the "South Park Academy." *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 14*(2), 61-76.

(1978). To make a difference—A report by Project Read programs. Some problems faced by the Patuxent Institution. Columbia MD: Read, Inc.

Toch, H. (1987, September). Regenerating prisoners through education. *Federal Probation, 51*(3), 61-66.

Townsend, T. (1991). Foreword. *Forum on Corrections Research, 3*(1), 2. (Correctional Service Canada)

Transactions of the National Prison Congress. Cincinnati, OH: 1870.

Traverso, G. B. (1975). Lavora carcerario e le misure alternatie alla pena detentiva ai sensi della legge 26 luglio 1975 N 354 [Work in Prison and Alternative Methods to Prison as Treated in the Law of July 20, 1975, N 354]. *Rassegna Di Criminologia, 6*(1-2), 201-210.

Traynelis-Yurek, E., & Yurek, F. G. (1990, September). Increased literacy through unison reading. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(3), 110-114.

Traynelis-Yurek, E., & Giacobbe, G. A. (1988). Unremediated learning disabilities and reincarceration. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 13*(1),163-74.

Truax, C. B., Wargo, D. G., & Silber, L. D. (1966). Effects of group psychotherapy with high accurate empathy and nonpossessive warmth upon female institutionalized delinquents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 71*(4), 269-274.

Truax, C. B., Wargo, D. G., & Volksdorf, N. R. (1970). Antecedents to outcome in group counseling with institutionalized juvenile delinquents: Effects of therapeutic conditions, patient self-exploration, alternative sessions and vicarious therapy pre-training. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 76*(2), 235-242.

Trudnak, D. M. (1990, September). The letter: A successful reading-writing strategy for adult basic education instruction in correctional institutions. *Journal of Correctional Education, 41*(3), 116-17.

Tulardilok, A. (1977). Assessment of the college level educational program at the state prison of southern Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/01A, 159.

Udell, D. S., et al. (1989) Oklahoma's nonviolent intermediate offender program: A success in rehabilitation. *Journal of Offender Counseling, 9*(2), 22-28.

U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Education Division. (1990). Microcomputer usage report. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

U.S. Comptroller General. (1980). *Women in prison—Inequitable treatment requires action.* Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1988). Technical appendix: Report to the nation on crime and justice, second edition. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

University of Oregon School of Community Service and Public Affairs. (1974). Oregon Project Newgate Final Report, April 1967 to December 1973. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon School of Community and Public Affairs.

Urner, L. H. (1976). *Recidivism rate of male inmates when considering vocational training, general education development tests, and the conditions of release from prison.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37/09A, 5785.

Valente, J., & Decostanzo, E. T. (1982). *Female offenders in the eighties. A continuum of services.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 082801.

Van Nagel, C. J., Foley, L. A., Dixon, M., & Kauffman, J. (1986, December). Review of treatment methods for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Correctional Education, 37*(4), 140-145.

Ventre, R. J. (1982, September). Cognitive moral development in the prison classroom. *Journal of Correctional Education, 33*(3), 18-26.

Vicinus, M., & Kinnard, C. (1980). I have lived with all the women I ever want to here. Teaching women's prison. In F. Cioffi (Ed.), *Unlocking shackled minds. A handbook for the college prison classroom.*

Villavicencio, T. C., & Gutierez, G C. (1978, April). Educacion en instituciones preventivas. Criminologia, *1*(5), 45-52.

Vogel, B. (1976). Inmate informational needs survey. Final Report. February, 1976. Arlington VA: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163890.

Wade, T. C., Morton, T. L., Lind, J. E., & Ferris, N. R. (1977). A family crisis intervention approach to diversion from the juvenile justice system. *Juvenile Justice Journal, 28*(3), 43-51.

Wagner, B. R., & Breitmeyer, R. G.(1975). PACE: A residential community oriented behavior modification program for adolescents. *Adolescence, 10*(38), 277-286.

Wagner, P. A., Jr. (1976). Adult education and the prison. *Adult Leadership, 24*, 263-264.

Waksman, M., Silverman, H., & Weber, K. (1983). Assessing the learning potential of penitentiary inmates: An application of feuerstein's learning potential assessment device. *Journal of Correctional Education, 34*(2), 63-69.

Walakafra-Wills, D. V. (1983). Inmate preferences toward jailhouse educational activities in designing an effective inmate educational enrichment program (Individualized Study Versus GED [General Education Diploma] Programming as a Systems Dynamics Model for Jails). Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 093199.

Waldo, G. P., & Chiricos, T. G. (1977). Work release and recidivism: An empirical evaluation of a social policy. *Evaluation Quarterly, 1*(1), 87-108.

Wallace, J. (1992). The role of post-secondary institutions in corrections. Unpublished speech, Martin University Conference on Andragogy, Indianapolis, IN.

Wallack, W. (Ed). (1940). *Prison administration—An educational process.* New York: American Prison Association.

Wallack, W. M., Kendall, G. M., MacCormick, A. H., & Cass, E. R. (1939). *Correctional education today: First yearbook of the committee on education, American Prison Association.* New York: American Prison Association.

Wallack, W., Kendall, G., & Briggs, H. (1939). *Education within prison walls.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Walsh, A. (1985, Summer). An evaluation of the effects of adult basic education on rearrest rates among probationers. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 9*(4), 69-76.

Walton, D. (1987). Residential, employment, and educational needs of offenders. In J. Harding, (Ed.), *Probation and the community.* Rockville, MD: National

Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, pp. 131-151. No. NCJ 116506.

Walton, R. S. (1978). *Dogmatism, self-concept, vocational and general education, and recidivism in the Mississippi State Corrections System.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/04A, 2000. University Microfilms No. 78-18-987.

(1972). Washington summary evaluation of juvenile parole learning centers, 1971-1972. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program.

Watts, T. J. (1990). *Prisoner access to legal assistance and the courts: A selected bibliography.* (Public Administration Series: Bibliography P 2943). Monticello, IL: Vance Bibliographies.

Wax., P. E. (1972). Social class, race, and juvenile delinquency: A review of the literature. *Child Psychology and Human Development, 3,* 36-49.

Weathers, L., & Liberman, R. P. (1975). Contingency contracting with families of delinquent adolescents. *Behavior Therapy, 6,* 356-366.

Webb, M. (1971). California Department of the Youth Authority: Reading and recidivism. Rockville, MD: National Institute for Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. NCJ 028097.

Webb, S. M., Maddox, M. E. (1986, May-June). The juvenile corrections interagency transition model: Moving students from institutions into community schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 7*(3), 56-61.

Wheeler, C. E., & Jones, L. K. (1977). Training former "incorrigible" inmates for new careers as correctional counselors. An evaluation. In M. Riedel & P. A. Vales, (Eds.), *Treating the offender. Problems and issues.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Whitehead, V., et al. (1987). Transitions: Vocational education from jail to community. Final Report.

Whitson, C. M. (1977). *Predictability from instructor evaluations of incarcerated vocational students to post-release adjustment to the world of work.* (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A M University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38/11A, 6679. (University Microfilms No. 78-06-850).

Whitson, K. S. (1977). *Comparison of the adult performance levels of women offenders in the Texas Department of Corrections and free-world women in Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, Ann Arbor, MI. (Available through University Microfilms).

Wiley, L. J. (1983). Affective education in a correctional setting. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 7*(2), 69-76.

Wiley, L. J. (1988, Spring-Summer). Moral education in a correctional setting: Reaching the goal by a different road. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 12*(2), 161-74.

Wiley III, E. (1989a, September 14). Prison education programs attempt to pick up where society failed. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 6*(13), 1, 8-9, 11-12.

Wiley III, E., & Conciatore, J. (1989b, September 28). Solutions to black male prison crisis: Elusive and difficult. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 6*(4), 6-9.

Willet, T. C. (January 1983). Prison guards in private. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 25*(1), 1-17.

Williams, D. (1977). *Rethinking correctional staff development.* Albany: State University of New York, School of Education.

Williams, H. N. (1978). *Development of a curriculum for black prisoners.* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39/06A, 3305. (University Microfilms No. 78-23-699).

Williams, J., & King, G. (1979). *Library services in Her Majesty's prisons in Staffordshire (England).* A Report. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program No. NCJ 070835.

Williford, M. (1991, August 20). Pell grant alert. Pep talk. An information exchange for prison education programs.

Wimer, M. (1983). Developing adult education programs for probation and parole.

Wimer, M. (1985). Teaching the hard-to-reach: Working with releasees and probationers. A handbook for adult educators.

Wines, E. C., & Dwight, T. W. (1867). Report on the prisons and reformatories of the United States and Canada. Albany, NY: Van Benthuysen & Sons.

Winick, C., & Saltman, E. B. (Winter 1982). A successful program utilizing labor union volunteers with young adult probationers. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 7*(2), 15-26.

Wirth, W. (1987). Preventive effects of correctional intervention: Reeducation and resocialization of juvenile prisoners. In K. Hurrelmann (Ed.), *Social intervention: Potential and constraints.* Berlin, West Germany: Walter de Gruyter and Company.

Wolf, J. G., & Sylves, D. (1981). *The impact of higher education opportunity programs. Post prison experience of disadvantaged students: A preliminary follow-up of HEOP exoffenders.* Final Report. New York State Education Department.

Wolford, B. (1982). *Correctional education.* Washington, DC. (Paper presented at the meeting of the American Criminal Justice Society)

Wolford, B. I. (1987). Correctional training: Training and education opportunities for delinquent and criminal offenders. In C. M. Nelson (Ed.), *Special education in the criminal justice system.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Wolford, B. (1983a). Correctional education and special education—An emerging partnership; or "Born to Lose." J. R. B. Rutherford (Ed.), *Severe behavior disorders of children and youth*. Monograph in Behavioral Disorders.

Wolford, B. I. (1979). *Impact of adult educational furlough program on offenders released by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40/08A, 4359.

Wolford, B. I. (1983b). Issues and challenges facing special education teachers in a correctional setting.

Wolford, B. I., et al. (1986). *Correctional education: Perspectives on programs for adult offenders*. Information Series, 310.

Wood, F. H. (1987). Special education, law and correctional education. In C. M. Nelson, (Ed.), et al., *Special education in the criminal justice system*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrille Publishing Co., pp. 85-99.

Wood, L. F., & Jenkins, W. O. (1971). Imprisoned resources-innovative techniques in educating prison inmates. University, AL: Rehabilitation Research Foundation. (Presented at the April, 1971, meeting in Miami, Florida, of the Southeastern Psychological Association).

Woodcock, R., & Johnson, M. (1977). *Woodcock-Johnson psycho educational battery*. Allen, TX: DLM Teaching Resources.

Wright, I. (1981). Corrections education and practical reasoning: Needs, methods, and research. In L. Morin (Ed.), *On prison education*. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, Ministry of the Soliciter General.

Wright, K. N. (1989, February). Race and economic marginality in explaining prison adjustment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 26*(1), 67-89.

Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S. (1976). *The criminal personality, Volume I: A profile for change*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Yockelson, S. & Samenow, S. (1977). *The criminal personality, Volume II: The change process*. New York: Jason Aronson.

(1984). Youth and the Justice System: Can We Intervene Earlier? Hearing before the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session. New Orleans, LA.

A Youth Reentry Specialist Program for Released Incarcerated Youth with Handicapping Conditions. (First Annual Report, September 1, 1985-August 31, 1986. Final Report.)

Zaremba, B. A., McCullough, B. C., & Broder, P. K. (1979). *Learning Disabilities and Juvenile Delinquency. A Handbook for Court Personnel, Judges, and Attorneys*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts Publications Department.

Zink, T. M. (1970). A Study of the Effects of Prison Education on Societal Adjustment. *Journal of Correctional Education, 22*, 18-22

212